

Maximization of Non-Concave Utility Functions in Discrete-Time Financial Market Models *

Laurence Carassus
Université de Reims

Miklós Rásonyi[†]
University of Edinburgh

31st December 2012

Abstract

This paper investigates the problem of maximizing expected terminal utility in a (generically incomplete) discrete-time financial market model with finite time horizon. In contrast to the standard setting, a possibly non-concave utility function U is considered, with domain of definition $\mathbb{R}$. Simple conditions are presented which guarantee the existence of an optimal strategy for the problem. In particular, the asymptotic elasticity of U plays a decisive role: existence can be shown when it is strictly greater at $-\infty$ than at $+\infty$.

1 Introduction

The problem of maximizing expected utility is one of the most significant issues in mathematical finance. To our knowledge, the first studies can be attributed to Merton [1969] and Samuelson [1969]. In mathematical terms, $EU(X)$ needs to be maximized in X , where U is a concave increasing function and X runs over values of admissible portfolios. For general existence results, we refer to Rásonyi and Stettner [2005] in a discrete time setting and to Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999] and Schachermayer [2001] in continuous time models, see also Biagini and Frittelli [2008], Owen and Žitković [2009] and the references therein for later developments.

Despite its ongoing success, the expected utility paradigm has been contested (see e.g. Allais [1953] and Kahneman and Tversky [1979]). In particular, Tversky and Kahneman [1992] suggested, based on experimental evidence, that the utility function should not be concave but rather “S-shaped” (i.e. $U(x) = U_+(x)$, $x \geq 0$; $U(x) = -U_-(-x)$, $x < 0$ where $U_{\pm} : \mathbb{R}_{\pm} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are concave and increasing).

In this article we propose to consider a general non-concave utility function defined on the real line (that can be “S-shaped” but our results can be applied to a broader class of utility functions). As the objective function is non-concave, the mathematical treatment becomes difficult and only few related results can be found in the literature.

In Tversky and Kahneman [1992] economic and psychological arguments are presented. Some authors have studied the rather specific case of continuous-time complete markets (see Carassus and Pham [2009] for piecewise concave, and Berkelaar et al. [2004] for S-shaped utility functions or Jin and Zhou [2008] and Carlier and Dana [2011], where distortions on the objective probability are considered) or one-period models (see Bernard and Ghossoub [2010] and He and Zhou [2011]). See also the recent paper of Reichlin [2011], in which the market is not complete but where the constraint on the budget set is given for one specific given pricing measure. Note that Berkelaar et al. [2004], Carassus and Pham [2009],

**Abbreviated title:* Non-concave utility maximization in discrete-time
AMS 2000 subject classification. Primary 93E20, 91B28; Secondary 91B16, 60G42.
Key words and phrases. Non-concave optimization, asymptotic elasticity.

[†]On leave from Rényi Institute, Budapest.

Carlier and Dana [2011] and Reichlin [2011] consider utility functions defined on the positive half-line only, which leads to a considerably simpler mathematical problem.

In the present article a general, possibly incomplete, discrete-time financial market model with finite horizon is considered together with a possibly non-concave utility function U defined on the real line. In our recent paper Carassus and Rásonyi [2013], we study a similar framework but with distortions on the objective probability. Under conditions similar to Assumption 2.4 of the present paper, a well-posedness result (*i.e.* the objective function is finite) is established but the existence of optimal strategies requires a particular structure for the filtration: the filtration should either be rich enough or there should exist an external source of randomness for the strategies. In this setup it turns out, in contrast to the usual maximization of expected utility problem, that an investor distorting the objective probability may increase her satisfaction by exploiting randomized trading strategies. So the existence result of Carassus and Rásonyi [2013] is not pertinent in the present setting without distortions and, to the best of our knowledge, Theorem 2.11, Corollary 2.12 and Proposition 4.4 below are the first existence results for optimal portfolios maximizing expected non-concave utility in an incomplete discrete-time model of a financial market.

The decisive sufficient conditions for existence are formulated below in terms of the “asymptotic elasticity” of the function U at $\pm\infty$. This concept surged in the concave case, see Karatzas et al. [1991], Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999] and Schachermayer [2001], which are the early references. Let’s denote by $u(x)$ the value function starting from an initial wealth x . In Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999] it is showed, in a general semimartingale model, that if U (i) is strictly concave, smooth and defined on $(0, +\infty)$, (ii) is such that there exists x satisfying $u(x) < \infty$ and (iii) has an asymptotic elasticity at $+\infty$, called $AE_+(U)$, strictly less than 1, then an optimal portfolio for the utility maximization problem exists. If U is defined over the whole real axis, Schachermayer [2001] showed existence assuming*, in addition, that the asymptotic elasticity of U at $-\infty$, called $AE_-(U)$, is strictly greater than 1. This condition being essentially necessary (see section 3 of Schachermayer [2001]), it has been generally accepted as the standard assumption in continuous-time models, see e.g. Owen and Žitković [2009]. Note, however, that in a discrete-time setting, when U is defined on $\mathbb{R}$, any of the two assumptions $AE_+(U) < 1$ or $AE_-(U) > 1$ on its own is sufficient to guarantee the existence of an optimal strategy (see Rásonyi and Stettner [2005]).

In the present study a general continuous, increasing and possibly non-concave function U defined on $\mathbb{R}$ is considered and we will assert the existence of an optimal strategy whenever $AE_+(U) < AE_-(U)$, where $AE_{\pm}(U)$ is an appropriate extension of the asymptotic elasticity concept to non-differentiable (and non-concave) functions. This generalizes results of Rásonyi and Stettner [2005]. Note that some conditions ensuring well-posedness are also necessary to stipulate. We present easily verifiable integrability assumptions to this end.

The key idea, as in Rásonyi and Stettner [2005], is to prove that strategies must satisfy certain a priori bounds in order to be optimal and then one can use compactness arguments. A number of measure-theoretic issues also need to be dealt with.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 we introduce our setup and state our main result; section 3 establishes the existence of an optimal strategy for the one-step case. In section 4 we prove our main result, using dynamic programming, and provide an easily verifiable sufficient condition for the market model that ensures well-posedness as well as the existence of an optimal strategy. Section 5 concludes, section 6 collects some nonstandard measure-theoretic facts.

2 Problem formulation

Let $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{0 \leq t \leq T}, P)$ be a discrete-time filtered probability space with time horizon $T \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that the sigma-algebras occurring in this paper contain all P -zero sets.

Let $\{S_t, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ be a d -dimensional adapted process representing the (discounted) price of d securities in the financial market in consideration. The notation $\Delta S_t := S_t - S_{t-1}$

*A condition on the so-called dual optimizer is also imposed and (ii) is replaced by the existence of some x satisfying $u(x) < U(\infty)$.

will often be used. If $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ then the concatenation xy stands for their scalar product.

In what follows, Ξ_t will denote the set of $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable d -dimensional random variables. Trading strategies are represented by d -dimensional predictable processes $(\phi_t)_{1 \leq t \leq T}$, where ϕ_t^i denotes the investor's holdings in asset i at time t ; predictability means that $\phi_t \in \Xi_{t-1}$. The family of all predictable trading strategies is denoted by Φ .

From now on the positive (resp. negative) part of some number or random variable X is denoted by X^+ (resp. X^-). We will consider quasi-integrable random variables X , i.e. for any sigma-field $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathfrak{S}$, $E(X|\mathcal{H})$ will be defined by $E(X|\mathcal{H}) = E(X^+|\mathcal{H}) - E(X^-|\mathcal{H})$, in a generalized sense, as soon as either $E(X^-|\mathcal{H}) < \infty$ or $E(X^+|\mathcal{H}) < \infty$. This implies that $E(X|\mathcal{H})$ can possibly be infinite. In particular, EX is defined (but can be infinity) whenever EX^+ or EX^- is finite. See section 6 for more details on generalized conditional expectations.

Remark 2.1 Like in Rásonyi and Stettner [2005], but in contrast to many continuous-time studies, we go beyond the class of (locally) bounded price processes. Therefore we will not use the usual “admissibility” requirements, i.e. we will allow portfolios whose value processes are not necessarily bounded from below. The rationality of this approach can be seen in the following example: assume that $T = 1$, $d = 1$, $S_0 = 0$ and ΔS_1 is a Gaussian random variable. Then $\phi_1 \Delta S_1$ is bounded from below if and only if $\phi_1 = 0$. So adding the admissibility requirement would seriously (and unreasonably) restrict the class of strategies to be used. See also section 1 of Schachermayer [2001] for a discussion on this subject, where it is argued that even in continuous-time utility maximisation problems one needs to include strategies with value processes that are not necessarily bounded from below.

The value at time t of a portfolio ϕ starting from initial capital $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$V_t^{x,\phi} = x + \sum_{i=1}^t \phi_i \Delta S_i.$$

The following absence of arbitrage condition is standard, it is equivalent to the existence of a risk-neutral measure in discrete time markets with finite horizon, see e.g. Dalang et al. [1990].

(NA) If $V_T^{0,\phi} \geq 0$ a.s. for some $\phi \in \Phi$ then $V_T^{0,\phi} = 0$ a.s.

Let $D_t(\omega) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the smallest affine subspace containing the support of the (regular) conditional distribution of ΔS_t with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, i.e. $P(\Delta S_t \in \cdot | \mathcal{F}_{t-1})(\omega)$. It is a non-empty $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ -measurable random subspace, see Proposition 4.2 below. If $D_t = \mathbb{R}^d$ then, intuitively, there are no redundant assets. Otherwise, one may always replace $\phi_t \in \Xi_{t-1}$ by its orthogonal projection ϕ'_t on D_t without changing the portfolio value since a.s. $\phi_t \Delta S_t = \phi'_t \Delta S_t$, see Remark 3.2 below as well as Remark 9.1 of Föllmer and Schied [2002].

We will need a “quantitative” characterization of (NA). From Rásonyi and Stettner [2005] (see also Jacod and Shiryaev [1998]), we know that

Proposition 2.2 (NA) implies the existence of $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random variables $\delta_t, \kappa_t > 0$ such that for all $\xi \in \Xi_t$ with $\xi \in D_{t+1}$ a.s.:

$$P(\xi \Delta S_{t+1} < -\delta_t |\xi| | \mathcal{F}_t) \geq \kappa_t \tag{1}$$

almost surely; for all $0 \leq t \leq T - 1$.

Remark 2.3 The “quantitative” characterization of (NA) given by (1) is only true for $\xi \in D_{t+1}$. This is the reason why we will have to project the strategy $\phi_{t+1} \in \Xi_t$ onto D_{t+1} . We refer again to Remark 3.2 below.

We now present the conditions on U which allow to assert the existence of an optimal strategy. The main point here is that we do not assume concavity of U .

Assumption 2.4 The utility function $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is non-decreasing, continuous and $U(0) = 0$. There exists $\underline{x} > 0, \bar{x} > 0, c \geq 0, \bar{\gamma} > 0$ and $\underline{\gamma} > 0$ such that $\boxed{\bar{\gamma} < \underline{\gamma}}$ and for any $\lambda \geq 1$

$$U(\lambda x) \leq \lambda \bar{\gamma} U(x) + c \text{ for } x \geq \bar{x} \quad (2)$$

$$U(\lambda x) \leq \lambda \underline{\gamma} U(x) \text{ for } x \leq -\underline{x}, \quad (3)$$

$$U(-\underline{x}) < 0. \quad (4)$$

Remark 2.5 A typical example is given by

$$U(x) = \begin{cases} U_+(x), & x \geq 0 \\ -U_-(-x), & x < 0, \end{cases}$$

where $U_+(x) = a_+ x^{\bar{\gamma}}, U_-(x) = a_- x^{\underline{\gamma}}$ for $a_{\pm} > 0$ and $0 < \bar{\gamma} < \underline{\gamma}$.

Remark 2.6 In this remark, we comment on the different items of Assumption 2.4. Fixing $U(0) = 0$ is mere convenience. If U is strictly increasing then (4) clearly follows from $U(0) = 0$ and $\underline{x} > 0$.

When U is concave and differentiable, the “asymptotic elasticity” of U at $\pm\infty$ is defined as

$$AE_+(U) = \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U'(x)x}{U(x)},$$

$$AE_-(U) = \liminf_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \frac{U'(x)x}{U(x)},$$

see Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999], Schachermayer [2001] and the references therein.

Assume for a moment that $c = 0$. It is shown in Lemma 6.3 of Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999] that $AE_+(U) \leq \bar{\gamma}$ is equivalent to (2). Similarly, $AE_-(U) \geq \underline{\gamma}$ is equivalent to (3). Note that the proof of Lemma 6.3 of Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999] does not use the concavity of U . So if U is differentiable then conditions (2) and (3) are equivalent to $AE_+(U) \leq \bar{\gamma}$ and $\underline{\gamma} \leq AE_-(U)$, respectively. It seems reasonable to extend the definitions of $AE_+(U)$ (resp. $AE_-(U)$) to possibly non-differentiable U as the infimum (resp. supremum) of $\bar{\gamma}$ (resp. $\underline{\gamma}$) such that (2) (resp. (3)) holds. Doing so we may see (looking at Assumption 2.4) that our paper asserts the existence of an optimal strategy whenever there exist $\bar{\gamma}, \underline{\gamma}$ such that

$$AE_+(U) \leq \bar{\gamma} < \underline{\gamma} \leq AE_-(U). \quad (5)$$

The case $c > 0$ is there only to handle bounded from above utility functions. In the case of a concave function U , it is easy to see that $U(\infty) < \infty$ implies that $AE_+(U) = 0$. For a non-concave utility function with $U(\infty) < \infty$, the condition $U(\lambda x) \leq \lambda \bar{\gamma} U(x) + c$ for all $x \geq \bar{x} > 0$, holds true for any $\bar{\gamma} > 0$, so with our definition of AE_+ as an infimum of such $\bar{\gamma}$, again $AE_+(U) = 0$. So (5) becomes $0 \leq \bar{\gamma} < \underline{\gamma} \leq AE_-(U)$. Note that we could assume in Assumption 2.4, instead of (2), that we have either $U(\infty) < \infty, c > 0$ and $\bar{\gamma} = 0$ or $U(\infty) = \infty, c = 0$ and $\bar{\gamma} > 0$.

So (5) is a direct extension of the condition of Schachermayer [2001], namely $AE_+(U) < 1 < AE_-(U)$. Note that Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999] requires only the condition $AE_+(U) < 1$ since they are dealing with functions U defined on $(0, \infty)$ only. The condition of Rásonyi and Stettner [2005], in a discrete-time setting like ours, is either $AE_+(U) < 1$ or $1 < AE_-(U)$. When U is concave (2) and (3) always hold with $\bar{\gamma} = \underline{\gamma} = 1$, i.e. $AE_+(U) \leq 1 \leq AE_-(U)$, (see Lemma 6.2 in Kramkov and Schachermayer [1999] and Schachermayer [2001]), so our paper generalizes Rásonyi and Stettner [2005] to U that is not necessarily concave.

We finish this remark with a comment on the condition $\bar{\gamma} < \underline{\gamma}$. It is, in some sense, minimal as one can see from the following example. Assume that $U_+(x) = x^\alpha$ and $U_-(x) = x^\beta$ with $\alpha \geq \beta$. Here one has that $\bar{\gamma} = \alpha$ and $\underline{\gamma} = \beta$. Assume that $S_0 = 0, \Delta S_1 = \pm 1$ with probabilities $p, 1 - p$ for some $0 < p < 1$. Then one gets

$$E(U(0 + n\Delta S_1)) = pn^\alpha - (1 - p)n^\beta.$$

If $\alpha > \beta$, choose $p = 1/2$ and $E(U(n\Delta S_1))$ goes to ∞ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. If $\alpha = \beta$, choose $p > 1/2$ and $E(U(n\Delta S_1)) = n^\alpha(2p - 1)$ also goes to ∞ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. So in the case $\bar{\gamma} \geq \underline{\gamma}$ the given problem immediately becomes ill-posed, even in this very simple example.

In this paper, we are dealing with maximizing the expected terminal utility $EU(V_T^{x,\phi})$ from initial endowment x . We would like to use a dynamic programming procedure and, to this end, we prove that the associated random functions are well defined and finite under appropriate integrability conditions.

Lemma 2.7 Assume that

$$E(U^-(x + y\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) < +\infty \quad (6)$$

a.s. holds true for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the following random functions are well-defined for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(x) &:= U(x), \\ U_{t-1}(x) &:= \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\xi \in \Xi_{t-1}} E(U_t(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \text{ a.s., for } 1 \leq t \leq T \end{aligned}$$

and we have for all $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$U_t(x) \geq U(x) > -\infty. \quad (7)$$

Moreover, for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \Xi_{t-1}$, we obtain that a.s.

$$E(U_t^-(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) < +\infty. \quad (8)$$

If we assume also that that $EU_0(x) < +\infty$ then we have that for all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \Xi_{t-1}$

$$E(U_t(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq U_{t-1}(x) < +\infty, \quad (9)$$

$$E(U_t^+(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) < +\infty. \quad (10)$$

Proof. Step 1: We first claim that (6) implies

$$E(U^-(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) < +\infty \quad (11)$$

a.s. for $\xi \in \Theta_{t-1}$ as well. Introduce the following vectors for each function $i \in W := \{-1, +1\}^d$:

$$\theta_i := (i(1), \dots, i(d)).$$

On $A_m := \{m-1 \leq |\xi| < m\}$ we have

$$U^-(x + \xi\Delta S_t) \leq \max_{i \in W} U^-(x + (m-1)\theta_i\Delta S_t) \leq \sum_{i \in W} U^-(x + (m-1)\theta_i\Delta S_t)$$

hence (6) (with the choice $y = (m-1)\theta_i$) implies that $E(1_{A_m} U^-(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) < \infty$. Our claim follows by Corollary 6.3.

Step 2: First, we note that $U^-(x) < +\infty$ by (6) applied with $y = 0$ and thus $U(x) > -\infty$. Now we prove by backward induction that (7) and (8) hold true and that the random function U_{t-1} is well-defined. At $t = T$, $U_t(x) \geq U(x)$ holds trivially true and (8) holds true by (11). This implies, by the definition of generalized expectation, that $E(U(x + \xi\Delta S_T)|\mathcal{F}_{T-1})$ is well-defined for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in \mathcal{F}_{T-1}$, and so is U_{T-1} as an essential supremum of well-defined random variables.

Assume that the statements (7), (8) hold true at $t+1$, i.e. the random function U_t is well defined and, choosing $\xi = 0$, we get that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$U_t(x) \geq E(U_{t+1}(x)|\mathcal{F}_t) \geq U(x) > -\infty,$$

where the second and the third inequality holds by the induction hypothesis (7). This implies also that

$$E(U_t^-(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq E(U^-(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) < +\infty,$$

by (11) again. So $E(U_t(x + \xi\Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$, as well as U_{t-1} , are well-defined and statements (7), (8) are proved.

Step 3: All the U_t are now well-defined by the preceding step. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and for $0 \leq j \leq T$, as $U_j^-(x) \leq U^-(x) < \infty$ by (7), $E(U_j^-(x)) < \infty$. Thus $E(U_j(x))$ is defined and by Lemma 6.2, $E(U_j(x)|\mathcal{F}_{j-1})$ is defined as well and

$$E(U_j(x)) = E(E(U_j(x)|\mathcal{F}_{j-1})).$$

Let $\xi \in \Xi_{t-1}$, $1 \leq t \leq T$, choosing the strategy equal to zero at the dates $1, \dots, t-1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} E(U_0(x)) &\geq E(E(U_1(x)|\mathcal{F}_0)) = E(U_1(x)) \geq \dots \geq E(E(U_{t-1}(x)|\mathcal{F}_{t-2})) \\ &= E(U_{t-1}(x)) \geq E(E(U_t(x + \xi \Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})). \end{aligned}$$

As $E(U_0(x)) < \infty$, we obtain that $E(U_{t-1}(x)) < \infty$. Recalling that $E(U_{t-1}^-(x)) < \infty$, we get that $U_{t-1}^\pm(x) < \infty$ and thus $U_{t-1}(x) < \infty$ and (9) holds true. Recalling (8), (10) holds also true. $\square$

In order to have a well-posed problem, we impose Assumption 2.8 below.

Assumption 2.8 For all $1 \leq t \leq T$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we assume that

$$E(U^-(x + y \Delta S_t)|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) < +\infty, \quad (12)$$

$$EU_0(x) < +\infty. \quad (13)$$

Remark 2.9 In Assumption 2.8, condition (13) is not easy to verify. We propose in Proposition 4.4 a fairly general setup where it is satisfied, see also Corollary 2.12. In contrast, condition (12) is a straightforward integrability condition on S . For instance, if $U(x) \geq -c(1 + |x|^p)$ for some $p, c > 0$ and $E|\Delta S_{t+1}|^p < \infty$ then (12) holds.

Assumption 2.8 can be written in a more convenient way for dynamic programming: see Lemma 2.10 below.

Lemma 2.10 Assumption 2.8 implies that for all $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random variables H and for all $\xi \in \Xi_t$, $0 \leq t < T$,

$$E(U_{t+1}^-(H + \xi \Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) < +\infty \text{ a.s.}, \quad (14)$$

$$E(U_{t+1}^+(H + \xi \Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) < +\infty \text{ a.s.} \quad (15)$$

Assumption 2.8 also implies that for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$E(U_{t+1}^-(x - |y||\Delta S_{t+1}|)|\mathcal{F}_t) < +\infty \text{ a.s.}, \quad (16)$$

$$E(U_{t+1}^+(x + |y||\Delta S_{t+1}|)|\mathcal{F}_t) < +\infty \text{ a.s.} \quad (17)$$

Proof. As $H = \sum_{p=-\infty}^{+\infty} H 1_{H \in [p, p+1)}$, applying Corollary 6.3 with $Z = U_{t+1}^\pm(H + \xi \Delta S_{t+1})$ and $A_p = \{H \in [p, p+1)\}$, it is enough to notice that

$$\begin{aligned} E(1_{H \in [p, p+1)} U_{t+1}^-(H + \xi \Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) &\leq 1_{H \in [p, p+1)} E(U_{t+1}^-(p + \xi \Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) < +\infty \text{ a.s.}, \\ E(1_{H \in [p, p+1)} U_{t+1}^+(H + \xi \Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) &\leq 1_{H \in [p, p+1)} E(U_{t+1}^+(p + 1 + \xi \Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) < +\infty \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

by (8) and (10).

Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We get that

$$U_{t+1}^+(x + |y||\Delta S_{t+1}|) \leq \max_{i \in W} U_{t+1}^+(x + |y|\theta_i \Delta S_{t+1}) \leq \sum_{i \in W} U_{t+1}^+(x + |y|\theta_i \Delta S_{t+1})$$

and (15) implies (17). Similarly,

$$U_{t+1}^-(x - |y||\Delta S_{t+1}|) \leq \max_{i \in W} U_{t+1}^-(x + |y|\theta_i \Delta S_{t+1}) \leq \sum_{i \in W} U_{t+1}^-(x + |y|\theta_i \Delta S_{t+1})$$

and (14) implies (16). $\square$

We are now able to state our main result.

Theorem 2.11 *Let U satisfy Assumption 2.4 and S satisfy the (NA) condition. We also suppose that Assumption 2.8 holds true. Then there exists a “one-step optimal” strategy $\phi^* \in \Phi$ satisfying, for all $t = 1, \dots, T$,*

$$E(U_t(V_t^{x,\phi^*})|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = U_{t-1}(V_{t-1}^{x,\phi^*}).$$

If, furthermore, $EU(V_T^{x,\phi^*})$ exists, then $\phi^* \in \Phi(U, x)$ and

$$EU(V_T^{x,\phi^*}) = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi(U, x)} EU(V_T^{x,\phi}),$$

where $\Phi(U, x)$ is the set of strategies $\phi \in \Phi$ for which $E[U(V_T^{x,\phi})]$ exists and it is finite.

We present the proof of Theorem 2.11 in section 4. To demonstrate its applicability, we state a simple corollary below. We will also provide a quite general setup where Theorem 2.11 applies and where $EU(V_T^{x,\phi^*})$ can be shown to exist (see Proposition 4.4 in section 4).

Corollary 2.12 *Assume that (NA) holds and the utility function $U : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is strictly increasing, continuous, bounded from above with $U(0) = 0$ and satisfies (12). Assume also that there exists $\underline{x} > 0$ and $\gamma > 0$ such that for any $\lambda \geq 1$, $U(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^\gamma U(x)$ for $x \leq -\underline{x}$. Then there exists $\phi^* \in \Phi(U, x)$ such that*

$$EU(V_T^{x,\phi^*}) = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi(U, x)} EU(V_T^{x,\phi}).$$

Proof. As U is bounded from above, (13) and thus Assumption 2.8 trivially holds under our assumptions. So do (4) and (2) (with, say, $\bar{\gamma} := \gamma/2$, $\bar{x} := 1$ and c any positive upper bound for $U(\infty)$), hence Assumption 2.4 is true. Since U is bounded from above, $E[U(V_T^{x,\phi^*})]$ exists automatically. Now Corollary 2.12 follows from Theorem 2.11. $\square$

Remark 2.13 In the absence of a concavity assumption on U we cannot expect to have a unique optimal strategy.

3 Existence of an optimal strategy for the one-step case

We prove the existence of an optimal strategy in the case of a one-step model. To this aim we introduce (i) a function V , (ii) two σ -algebras $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{F}$ containing P -zero sets, (iii) a d -dimensional $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable random variable Y , and (iv) a random set D .

Assumption 3.1 We have $D \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and for almost all ω , $D(\omega)$ is a non-empty vector subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is the smallest affine subspace containing the support of $P(Y \in \cdot | \mathcal{H})(\omega)$.

We will denote by Ξ the family of $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable d -dimensional random variables. This setting will be applied in section 4 with the choice $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_t$, $D = D_t$, $Y = \Delta S_t$; $V(x)$ will be the maximal conditional expected utility from capital x if trading begins at time t , i.e. $V = U_t$.

Remark 3.2 Let $\xi \in \Xi$ and let $\xi' \in \Xi$ be the orthogonal projection of ξ on D (this is $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable by Proposition 4.6 of Rásonyi and Stettner [2005]). Then $\xi - \xi' \perp D$ a.s. hence $\{Y \in D\} \subset \{(\xi - \xi')Y = 0\}$. It follows that

$$P(\xi Y = \xi' Y | \mathcal{H}) = P((\xi - \xi')Y = 0 | \mathcal{H}) \geq P(Y \in D | \mathcal{H}) = 1$$

a.s., by the definition of D . Hence $P(\xi Y = \xi' Y) = E(P(\xi Y = \xi' Y | \mathcal{H})) = 1$.

We impose the following conditions on D , Y , V and $\mathcal{H}$:

Assumption 3.3 There exist $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variables $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$ such that for all $\xi \in \Xi$ with $\xi \in D$ a.s.:

$$P(\xi Y \leq -\alpha \|\xi\| | \mathcal{H}) \geq \beta. \tag{18}$$

We make the following assumptions on V .

Assumption 3.4 Let $V(\omega, x)$ be a function from $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that for almost all ω , $V(\omega, \cdot)$ is a nondecreasing, finite-valued, continuous function and $V(\cdot, x)$ is $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable for each fixed x .

We also need the following integrability conditions:

Assumption 3.5 For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$E(V^-(x - |y||Y|)|\mathcal{H}) < +\infty \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (19)$$

Assumption 3.6 For all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$E(V^+(x + |y||Y|)|\mathcal{H}) < +\infty \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (20)$$

Remark 3.7 Let H, ξ be arbitrary $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variables. Then, under Assumptions 3.5 and 3.6, $E(V(H + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H})$ exists and it is finite. Indeed, define the events $A_m := \{|H| < m, |\xi| < m\}$. Clearly, on A_m , $V^+(H + \xi Y) \leq V^+(m + m|Y|)$ and $V^-(H + \xi Y) \leq V^-(-m - m|Y|)$, hence by Assumptions 3.5 and 3.6, $E(V^\pm(H + \xi Y)1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})$ exists and is finite which implies our claim by Corollary 6.3.

We finally assume the following growth conditions on V .

Assumption 3.8 Almost surely for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda \geq 1$,

$$V(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\overline{\gamma}} V(x) + C\lambda^{\overline{\gamma}}, \quad (21)$$

$$V(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} V(x) + C\lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} \quad (22)$$

hold for some constants $C > 0$ and $\underline{\gamma} > \overline{\gamma} > 0$.

Assumption 3.9 There exists a non-negative, $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable N such that

$$P\left(V(-N) < -\frac{2C}{\beta} - 1|\mathcal{H}\right) \geq 1 - \beta/2 \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (23)$$

The aim of this section is to study $v(x) = v(\omega, x)$, defined by

$$v(x) := \text{ess. sup}_{\xi \in \Xi} E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}). \quad (24)$$

The function $v(x)$ will represent the maximal expected utility from capital x if trading begins at time $t - 1$. Now we briefly sketch the strategy for proving the existence of an optimal portfolio in the one-step case. First, we prove that strategies in order to be optimal have to be bounded by some random variable K (Lemma 3.10). Then we establish that $E(V(x + yY)|\mathcal{H})$ has a version $G(\omega, x, y)$ which is jointly continuous in (x, y) (Lemma 3.12). Let $A^K(\omega, x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d, |y| \leq K} G(\omega, x, y)$. We prove that A^K is continuous in x and that $A = A^K = v$ a.s., where $A(\omega, x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} G(\omega, x, y)$ (Lemma 3.13). Based on the preceding steps, we can construct a sequence $\xi_n(\omega, x)$ taking values in D along which the supremum in the function A is attained and ξ_n is also jointly measurable (Lemma 3.15). The boundedness of optimal strategies and a compactness argument provide a limit $\tilde{\xi}$ of ξ_n (Lemma 3.16), which turns out to be an optimal strategy.

Lemma 3.10 Let Assumptions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 hold. Fix $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x_0 < x_1$. Then there exists an $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable $K = K(\omega, x_0, x_1) > 0$ such that for all $x_0 \leq x \leq x_1$, almost surely, we have:

$$v(x) = \text{ess. sup}_{\xi \in \Xi, |\xi| \leq K} E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}). \quad (25)$$

We also have that $-\infty < v(x) < +\infty$ a.s. Finally, for any $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable positive random variable I there exists a positive and $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable N' such that $v(-N') \leq -I$ a.s.

Proof. First note that

$$v(\omega, x) = \text{ess. sup}_{\xi \in \Xi, \xi \in D} E(V(x + \xi Y) | \mathcal{H})(\omega),$$

by Remark 3.2. So from now we assume that $\xi \in D$. We may as well assume $D \neq \{0\}$ a.s. since the statement of this Lemma is clear on the event $\{D = \{0\}\}$.

Fix some $x_0 \leq x \leq x_1$. Take $\xi \in \Xi$ with $|\xi| \geq \max(1, x^+)$. We will prove that there exists an $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable $K = K(\omega, x_0, x_1) > 0$ such that for all $x_0 \leq x \leq x_1$ and for $|\xi| \geq K$, we have almost surely:

$$E(V(x + \xi Y) | \mathcal{H}) \leq E(V(x) | \mathcal{H}). \quad (26)$$

Then (25) follows immediately.

As $\bar{\gamma} < \underline{\gamma}$ it is possible to choose η such that $0 < \eta < 1$ and $\bar{\gamma} < \eta \underline{\gamma}$. By (21), we have the following estimation:

$$\begin{aligned} V(x + \xi Y) &= V(x + \xi Y)1_{V(x + \xi Y) \geq 0} + V(x + \xi Y)1_{V(x + \xi Y) < 0} \\ &\leq 1_{V(x + \xi Y) \geq 0} \left(|\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}} V \left(\frac{x^+}{|\xi|} + \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} Y \right) + C|\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}} \right) + V(x + \xi Y)1_{V(x + \xi Y) < 0} \end{aligned}$$

We start with the estimation of the positive part of V . Let

$$L := E(V^+(1 + |Y|) | \mathcal{H}). \quad (27)$$

The random variable L is finite by Assumption 3.6. Thus, as V is nondecreasing (see Assumption 3.4), we obtain that

$$E \left(1_{V(x + \xi Y) \geq 0} V \left(\frac{x^+}{|\xi|} + \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} Y \right) | \mathcal{H} \right) \leq E \left(V^+ \left(1 + \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} Y \right) | \mathcal{H} \right) \leq L.$$

For the estimation of the negative part, we introduce the event

$$B := \left\{ V(x + \xi Y) < 0, \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} Y < -\alpha, V(-N) < -\frac{2C}{\beta} - 1 \right\}. \quad (28)$$

Then, using (22), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} -V(x + \xi Y)1_{V(x + \xi Y) < 0} &\geq -V(x + \xi Y)1_B \\ &\geq -1_B \left(|\xi|^{\eta \underline{\gamma}} V \left(\frac{x^+}{|\xi|^\eta} + \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} Y |\xi|^{1-\eta} \right) + C|\xi|^{\eta \underline{\gamma}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that B contains

$$\left\{ x^+ - \alpha|\xi| < -N, \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} Y < -\alpha, V(-N) < -\frac{2C}{\beta} - 1 \right\}.$$

Now, from Assumption 3.9, for all $\xi \in \Xi$ such that $\xi \in D$ a.s., we have (recalling Assumption 3.3):

$$\begin{aligned} P \left(\left\{ \frac{\xi}{|\xi|} Y < -\alpha, V(-N) < -\frac{2C}{\beta} - 1 \right\} | \mathcal{H} \right) &\geq P \left(V(-N) < -\frac{2C}{\beta} - 1 | \mathcal{H} \right) \\ &\quad + P(V(\xi Y < -\alpha | \xi| | \mathcal{H}) - 1 \\ &\geq 1 - \beta/2 + \beta - 1 \\ &\geq \beta/2. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Assume that $x^+ - \alpha|\xi| < -N$ and $\frac{x^+}{|\xi|^\eta} - |\xi|^{1-\eta}\alpha < -N$ hold true. This is true if $|\xi| \geq K_0(x^+) = \max(1, x^+, \left(\frac{x^+ + N}{\alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}, \frac{x^+ + N}{\alpha})$ (recall that $0 < \eta < 1$ and we have assumed $|\xi| \geq \max(1, x^+)$). Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} E(V(x + \xi Y)1_{V(x + \xi Y) < 0} | \mathcal{H}) &\leq |\xi|^{\eta \underline{\gamma}} E(1_B V(-N) | \mathcal{H}) + 1_B C |\xi|^{\eta \underline{\gamma}} \\ &\leq -(\beta/2) |\xi|^{\eta \underline{\gamma}}. \end{aligned}$$

We make a little digression which will be useful when proving the existence of some non negative and $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable N' satisfying $v(-N') \leq -I$ a.s., for any $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable positive random variable I .

Looking carefully at the estimations above, if $x < 0$ and $|\xi| \geq \max(1, (\frac{N}{\alpha})^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}, \frac{N}{\alpha})$, we have that

$$E(V(x + \xi Y)1_{V(x + \xi Y) \geq 0}|\mathcal{H}) + \frac{1}{2}E(V(x + \xi Y)1_{V(x + \xi Y) < 0}|\mathcal{H}) \leq 0 \quad (30)$$

provided that $|\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}}L + C|\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}} - \frac{\beta}{4}|\xi|^{\eta\gamma} \leq 0$. So (30) holds true provided that $|\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}}L - \frac{\beta}{8}|\xi|^{\eta\gamma} \leq 0$, and $C|\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}} - \frac{\beta}{8}|\xi|^{\eta\gamma} \leq 0$, i.e.

$$|\xi| \geq \tilde{K}_1 = \max\left(1, \frac{N}{\alpha}, \left(\frac{N}{\alpha}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}}, \left(\frac{8L}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\eta\gamma-\bar{\gamma}}}, \left(\frac{8C}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\eta\gamma-\bar{\gamma}}}\right). \quad (31)$$

Going back to our primary goal and putting together our estimations, for $|\xi| \geq K_0(x^+)$ we have

$$E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq |\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}}L + C|\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}} - \frac{\beta}{2}|\xi|^{\eta\gamma}.$$

In order to get (26), it is enough to have

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}}L - \frac{\beta}{6}|\xi|^{\eta\gamma} &< 0 \\ C|\xi|^{\bar{\gamma}} - \frac{\beta}{6}|\xi|^{\eta\gamma} &< 0 \\ -\frac{\beta}{6}|\xi|^{\eta\gamma} - E(V(-x^-)|\mathcal{H}) &< 0. \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Since $\bar{\gamma} < \eta\gamma < \gamma$, the first two inequalities will be satisfied as soon as $|\xi| \geq K_1(x^+) = \max\left(K_0(x^+), \left(\frac{6L}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\eta\gamma-\bar{\gamma}}}, \left(\frac{6C}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\eta\gamma-\bar{\gamma}}}\right)$ and the last one as soon as $|\xi| \geq K_2(x^-) = \left(\frac{6[E(V(-x^-)|\mathcal{H})]^-}{\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{\eta\gamma}}$.

So (26) is satisfied if $|\xi| \geq \tilde{K}(x) = \max(K_1(x^+), K_2(x^-))$, where $\tilde{K}(x)$ is an $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable. Note that $\tilde{K}(x)$ is a polynomial function of $\frac{1}{\alpha}$, $\frac{1}{\beta}$, N , $[E(V(-x^-)|\mathcal{H})]^-$ and L . We conclude by setting $K := \max(K_1(x_1^+), K_2(x_0^-))$.

We now show that v is finite. Let $\xi \in \Xi$, $|\xi| \leq K$,

$$-E(V^-(|-x| - K|Y|)|\mathcal{H}) \leq E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq E(V^+(|x| + K|Y|)|\mathcal{H}), \quad (33)$$

and we conclude by Assumptions 3.5 and 3.6.

Let I be a $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable positive random variable, it remains to show that there exists a positive and $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable N' satisfying $v(-N') \leq -I$ a.s. Assume for a moment that $x \leq -N$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} -E(V(x + \xi Y)1_{V(x + \xi Y) < 0}|\mathcal{H}) &\geq -E\left(1_{\{\frac{\xi}{|\xi|}Y < -\alpha, V(-N) < -\frac{2C}{\beta}-1\}}V(x - \alpha|\xi|)|\mathcal{H}\right) \\ &\geq -E\left(1_{\{\frac{\xi}{|\xi|}Y < -\alpha, V(-N) < -\frac{2C}{\beta}-1\}}V(x)|\mathcal{H}\right) \\ &\geq \left(\left(1 + \frac{2C}{\beta}\right)\left(\frac{x}{-N}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - C\left(\frac{x}{-N}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\right)\frac{\beta}{2} \\ &\geq \frac{\beta}{2}\left(\frac{x}{-N}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Assumption 3.8 (see (22)), (29) and the fact that $\beta \leq 1$. Thus, if $|\xi| \leq \tilde{K}_1$, we obtain that

$$E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq E(V^+(\tilde{K}_1|Y|)|\mathcal{H}) - \frac{\beta}{2}\left(\frac{x}{-N}\right)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \quad (34)$$

Recall the definition of $\tilde{K}_1$ (see (31)) and (30): if $|\xi| \geq \tilde{K}_1$ we get that

$$E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq \frac{1}{2}E(1_{V(x+\xi Y)<0}V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq -\frac{\beta}{2}\left(\frac{x}{-N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}}. \quad (35)$$

The right-hand sides of both (34) and (35) are smaller than $-I$ if

$$\left(\frac{x}{-N}\right)^{\frac{1}{\beta}} \geq \frac{2}{\beta}\left(I + E(V^+(\tilde{K}_1|Y)|\mathcal{H})\right). \quad (36)$$

We may and will assume that $I \geq (1/2)$ which implies $2I/\beta \geq 1$. So there exists an $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable

$$N' := N\left(\frac{2}{\beta}\left(I + E(V^+(\tilde{K}_1|Y)|\mathcal{H})\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq N, \quad (37)$$

such that, as soon as $x \leq -N'$, $E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq -I$ a.s. and, taking the supremum over all ξ , $v(x) \leq -I$ a.s. holds. From (37), one can see that N' is a polynomial function of $\frac{1}{\beta}$, N , I and $E(V^+(\tilde{K}_1|Y)|\mathcal{H})$. $\square$

Remark 3.11 Note that $\tilde{K}(x)$ in the above proof depends on x only through $\tilde{K}_0(x^+)$, which is polynomial in x^+ , and $[E(V(-x^-)|\mathcal{H})]^-$. Hence if $V(x) \geq m(1 + |x|^p)$ for some $m, p > 0$ then $\tilde{K}(x)$ depends on x in a polynomial way. Note also that $\tilde{K}(x)$ is a polynomial function of x^+ , N , $1/\alpha$, $1/\beta$, L and $[E(V(-x^-)|\mathcal{H})]^-$.

Lemma 3.12 *Let Assumptions 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 hold. Then there exists a version $G(\omega, x, y)$, $(\omega, x, y) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ of $E(V(x + yY)|\mathcal{H})(\omega)$ such that*

(i) for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow G(\omega, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}$ is continuous and nondecreasing in x ;

(ii) for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $\omega \in \Omega \rightarrow G(\omega, x, y) \in \mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable;

(iii) for each $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable ξ , we have that a.s. $E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H})$ exists, it is finite and

$$G(\omega, x, \xi) = E(V(x + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}). \quad (38)$$

Proof. For part (i) of Lemma 3.12, we proceed in three steps. First, we define a version of $(q, r) \rightarrow E(V(q + rY)|\mathcal{H})(\omega)$ which is uniformly continuous on any precompact set $\mathbb{Q}^{d+1} \cap [-N, N]^{d+1}$. Then, in the second step, we extend this version by continuity to $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ and in the third step we show that this extension is, in fact, a version of $(x, y) \rightarrow E(V(x + yY)|\mathcal{H})$.

Step 1: Let us fix a version $G(\omega, q, r)$ of $E(V(q + rY)|\mathcal{H})(\omega)$ for all $(q, r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{d+1}$. Fix $N > 0$. We claim that, for almost every ω , the function $(q, r) \rightarrow G(\omega, q, r)$ is uniformly continuous on $[-N, N]^{d+1} \cap \mathbb{Q}^{d+1}$, i.e.,

$$P(\cap_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} M_\ell) = 1, \quad (39)$$

where

$$M_\ell := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{|q_1 - q_2| + |r_1 - r_2| \leq (1/k)} \{|G(q_1, r_1) - G(q_2, r_2)| \leq \frac{1}{\ell}\}.$$

Fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. By Assumption 3.4, $(x, y) \rightarrow V(x + yY)$ is a.s. continuous and hence a.s. uniformly continuous on $[-N, N]^{d+1}$. So there is a random variable $\zeta_\ell > 0$ such that

$$|V(x + yY) - V(z + wY)| \leq \frac{1}{2\ell} \quad (40)$$

whenever $(x, y), (z, w) \in [-N, N]^{d+1}$ and $|x - z| + |y - w| \leq \zeta_\ell$.

As $-V^- \leq V \leq V^+$, we get that $-V^-(q - |r||Y|) \leq V(q + rY) \leq V^+(q + |r||Y|)$, and from Assumptions 3.5 and 3.6,

$$E\left(\sup_{(q,r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} \cap [-N,N]^{d+1}} |V(q + rY)|\right) < \infty \text{ a.s.}$$

Thus it is easy to see that there exists an $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable η_ℓ such that for any event A such that $P(A|\mathcal{H}) < \eta_\ell$ a.s., one has

$$E \left(1_A \sup_{(q,r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} \cap [-N,N]^{d+1}} |V(q+rY)| | \mathcal{H} \right) < \frac{1}{4\ell}.$$

Then we can easily choose an $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable $\mathbb{N}$ -valued random variable ψ_ℓ such that $P(1/\psi_\ell \geq \zeta_\ell | \mathcal{H}) \leq \eta_\ell$. Define the set $B = B(q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2, \ell) := \{\omega : |q_1 - q_2| + |r_1 - r_2| \leq 1/\psi_\ell(\omega)\}$. By (40), definition of η_ℓ and ψ_ℓ , we a.s. have

$$\begin{aligned} 1_B |G(\omega, q_1, r_1) - G(\omega, q_2, r_2)| &\leq E(1_B |V(q_1 + r_1 Y) - V(q_2 + r_2 Y)| | \mathcal{H}) \\ &\leq E \left(\frac{1_B}{2\ell} 1_{\{(1/\psi_\ell) \leq \zeta_\ell\}} | \mathcal{H} \right) + \\ &\quad 21_B E \left(1_{\{(1/\psi_\ell) > \zeta_\ell\}} \sup_{(q,r) \in \mathbb{Q}^{d+1} \cap [-N,N]^{d+1}} |V(q+rY)| | \mathcal{H} \right) \\ &\leq 1_B \left(\frac{1}{2\ell} + 2\frac{1}{4\ell} \right) = 1_B \frac{1}{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$M_\ell \supseteq \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{|q_1 - q_2| + |r_1 - r_2| \leq (1/k)} B(q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2, \ell) \text{ a.s.}$$

That is, $P(\bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{|q_1 - q_2| + |r_1 - r_2| \leq (1/k)} B(q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2, \ell) \setminus M_\ell) = 0$. Fix ℓ . In order to show (39), it suffices to prove that for all $\omega \in \Omega$ there is k such that

$$\omega \in \bigcap_{|q_1 - q_2| + |r_1 - r_2| \leq (1/k)} B(q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2, \ell).$$

Indeed, choose $k := \psi_\ell(\omega)$, then $\omega \in B(q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2, \ell)$ for all q_1, q_2, r_1, r_2 such that $|q_1 - q_2| + |r_1 - r_2| \leq (1/k)$. This concludes step 1.

Step 2: Clearly, there is a unique extension by continuity of $G(\omega, x, y)$ over $[-N, N]^{d+1}$, for a.e. ω . Thus $G(\omega, x, y)$ can be defined for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ in a continuous way. Note that, for all $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$, $y \in \mathbb{Q}^d$,

$$G(\omega, q_1, y) \leq G(\omega, q_2, y)$$

holds on a subset of full measure and this extends to $q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by continuity.

Step 3: It remains to show that, for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, $G(\omega, x, y) = E(V(x + yY) | \mathcal{H})(\omega)$ for a.e. ω . To see this, let $(q_n, r_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^{d+1}$ and $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ be such that (q_n, r_n) tends to (x, y) . By continuity, $G(\omega, q_n, r_n)$ tends to $G(\omega, x, y)$. By Assumption 3.4, V is almost surely continuous and $V(q_n + r_n Y(\omega))(\omega)$ goes to $V(x + yY(\omega))(\omega)$ almost surely. Moreover, there exists some n_0 such that for $n \geq n_0$, $x - 1 \leq q_n \leq x + 1$ and $|r_n| \leq |y| + 1$. As by Assumption 3.4 V is non-decreasing, we get that

$$-V^-(x - 1 - (|y| + 1)|Y|) \leq V(q_n + r_n Y) \leq V^+(x + 1 + (|y| + 1)|Y|).$$

By Assumptions 3.5 and 3.6, we can apply Lemma 6.5 (conditional Lebesgue theorem) and conclude that $G(\omega, q_n, r_n)$ tends to $E(V(x + yY) | \mathcal{H})$: (i) is proved.

Step 4: Assertion (ii) is straightforward, by the definition of conditional expectations.

Step 5: As for Assertion (iii), (38) is clear for constants ξ . We prove (38) for $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable step functions $\varsigma = \sum_n y_n 1_{\varsigma=y_n}$ next. It is clear that $1_{\varsigma=y_n} G(\omega, x, \varsigma) = 1_{\varsigma=y_n} G(\omega, x, y_n) = E(1_{\varsigma=y_n} V(x + y_n Y) | \mathcal{H}) = E(1_{\varsigma=y_n} V(x + \varsigma Y) | \mathcal{H})$. So if we can apply Corollary 6.3 to $W = G(\omega, x, \varsigma)$, $Z = V(x + \varsigma Y)$ and $A_n = \{\varsigma = y_n\}$, we can conclude that $G(\omega, x, \varsigma) = E(V(x + \varsigma Y) | \mathcal{H})$. This Corollary does apply since $E(1_{A_n} V(x + y_n Y) | \mathcal{H})$ exists and it is finite by Assumptions 3.5 and 3.6.

Now every $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable ξ can be uniformly approximated by a sequence of $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable step functions $(\varsigma_n)_n$ and we can conclude using (i) and Lemma 6.5 (conditional Lebesgue theorem) as before. $\square$

Lemma 3.13 *Let Assumptions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 hold. Define $A(\omega, x) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d} G(\omega, x, y)$ for $(\omega, x) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}$. Fix some $x_0, x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. For $x_0 \leq x \leq x_1$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, let $A^K(\omega, x) := \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d, |y| \leq K(\omega, x_0, x_1)} G(\omega, x, y)$, where $K(\omega, x_0, x_1)$ is defined in Lemma 3.10. Then we get that, on a set of full measure,*

- (i) *the function $x \rightarrow A^K(\omega, x)$, $x \in [x_0, x_1]$ is non-decreasing and continuous,*
- (ii) *$v(\omega, x) = A^K(\omega, x) = A(\omega, x)$ for all $x \in [x_0, x_1]$. One even has that*

$$P(A(\cdot, x) = A^K(\cdot, x) \text{ for all } x \in [x_0, x_1]) = 1. \quad (41)$$

Remark 3.14 Considering the increasing sequence of events $\{A(\cdot, x) = A^K(\cdot, x) \text{ for all } x \in [-n, n]\}$, (41) allow us extend $A = A^K$ to $\mathbb{R}$ in such a way that properties (i) and (ii) continue to hold on $\mathbb{R}$. Note that, by (ii), A is a non-decreasing and continuous version of v . We will use this version from now on.

Proof. We prove (i) in two steps. First, we show that $x \rightarrow A^K(\omega, x)$ is continuous. Then we prove that $q \rightarrow A^K(\omega, q)$ (as well as $q \rightarrow A(\omega, q)$) are non-decreasing on $\mathbb{Q}$. By step 1, the monotonicity argument extends by continuity to $\mathbb{R}$ and (i) is proved. We will work on the full-measure set $\tilde{\Omega}$ where all the conclusions of Lemma 3.12 hold.

Step 1: Fix some $x \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $x_0 \leq x \leq x_1$ and $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$. Let $x_n \in [x_0, x_1]$ be a sequence of real numbers converging to x . By definition of A^K , for all k , there exists some $y_k(\omega, x) \in \mathbb{Q}^d$, $|y_k(\omega, x)| \leq K(\omega, x_0, x_1)$ and $G(\omega, x, y_k(\omega, x)) \geq A^K(\omega, x) - 1/k$. Moreover, one has that $A^K(\omega, x_n) \geq G(\omega, x_n, y_k(\omega, x))$ for all n , and by Lemma 3.12 (i),

$$\liminf_n A^K(\omega, x_n) \geq G(\omega, x, y_k(\omega, x)) \geq A^K(\omega, x) - 1/k,$$

and letting k go to zero,

$$\liminf_n A^K(\omega, x_n) \geq A^K(\omega, x). \quad (42)$$

Note that $A^K(\omega, x_n)$ is defined as the supremum over a precompact set. Thus there exists $y_n^*(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|y_n^*(\omega)| \leq K(\omega, x_0, x_1)$ and $A^K(\omega, x_n) = G(\omega, x_n, y_n^*(\omega))$. By compactness, there exists some $y^*(\omega)$ such that some subsequence $y_{n_k}^*(\omega)$ of $y_n^*(\omega)$ goes to $y^*(\omega)$, $k \rightarrow \infty$, and $\limsup_n A^K(\omega, x_n) = \lim_k A^K(\omega, x_{n_k})$. By Lemma 3.12 (i), one gets

$$\limsup_n A^K(\omega, x_n) = G(\omega, x, y^*(\omega)) \leq A^K(\omega, x).$$

Recalling (42), this concludes the proof of continuity for A^K .

Step 2: We argue ω -wise again. Let $q_1 \leq q_2$. By definition of A^K , there exists some $y_n^1(\omega) \in \mathbb{Q}^d$ satisfying $G(\omega, q_1, y_n^1(\omega)) \geq A^K(\omega, q_1) - 1/n$. Moreover, one has that $A^K(\omega, q_2) \geq G(\omega, q_2, y_n^1(\omega))$. So, as by Lemma 3.12 (i), $G(\omega, q_2, y_n^1(\omega)) \geq G(\omega, q_1, y_n^1(\omega))$, we get that $A^K(\omega, q_2) \geq A^K(\omega, q_1) - 1/n$. We conclude, by letting n go to zero, that the inequality $A^K(\omega, q_1) \leq A^K(\omega, q_2)$ holds on $\tilde{\Omega}$ for any pairs $q_1 \leq q_2$ of rational numbers. A similar argument provides monotonicity of $A(\omega, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{Q}$ for $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ as well.

Step 3: We now turn to the second part of Lemma 3.13. Fix some $\hat{x} \in \mathbb{R}$, we want to prove that, almost surely,

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d, |y| \leq K(\omega, x_0, x_1)} G(\omega, \hat{x}, y) = \text{ess.} \sup_{\xi \in \Xi, |\xi| \leq K(\omega, x_0, x_1)} G(\omega, \hat{x}, \xi) \quad (43)$$

and also that the same equality holds without the bound $K(\omega, x_0, x_1)$.

Once this has been established, from the definition of v , A and (38) we obtain

$$v(\hat{x}) = \text{ess.} \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} E(V(\hat{x} + \xi Y) | \mathcal{H}) = \text{ess.} \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} G(\omega, \hat{x}, \xi) = A(\hat{x}).$$

Using also Lemma 3.10, (38) and the definition of A^K , we obtain

$$v(\hat{x}) = \text{ess.} \sup_{\xi \in \Xi, |\xi| \leq K(\omega, x_0, x_1)} E(V(\hat{x} + \xi Y) | \mathcal{H}) = \text{ess.} \sup_{\xi \in \Xi, |\xi| \leq K(\omega, x_0, x_1)} G(\omega, \hat{x}, \xi) = A^K(\hat{x}),$$

as well, so (ii) holds. In order to get (43), we will show the following claim.

Claim: Let $F : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function such that for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$, $F(\omega, \cdot)$ is continuous and for each $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $F(\cdot, y)$ is $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable. Let $K > 0$ be an $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable. Set $f(\omega) = \text{ess. sup}_{\xi \in \Xi, |\xi| \leq K(\omega)} F(\omega, \xi(\omega))$. Then, for almost all ω ,

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d, |y| \leq K(\omega)} F(\omega, y) = f(\omega). \quad (44)$$

By p. 70 of Castaing and Valadier [1977], F is $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable and so is

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d, |y| \leq K(\omega)} F(\omega, y) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{Q}^d, |y| \leq K(\omega)} F(\omega, y).$$

Hence $\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d, |y| \leq K(\omega)} F(\omega, y) \geq f(\omega)$ a.s. by the definition of essential supremum. Assume that the inequality is strict with positive probability. Then for some $\varepsilon > 0$ the set

$$A = \{(\omega, y) \in \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^d : |y| \leq K(\omega); F(\omega, y) - f(\omega) \geq \varepsilon\}$$

has a projection A' on Ω with $P(A') > 0$. Recall $\omega \rightarrow F(\omega, \xi(\omega))$ is $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable for $\xi \in \Xi$. By definition of the essential supremum, f is $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable and hence $A \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The measurable selection theorem (see for example Proposition III.44 in Dellacherie and Meyer [1979]) applies and there exists some $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable η such that $(\omega, \eta(\omega)) \in A$ for $\omega \in A'$ (and $\eta(\omega) = 0$ on the complement of A'). This leads to a contradiction since for all $\omega \in A'$, $f(\omega) < F(\omega, \eta(\omega))$ by the construction of η and $f(\omega) \geq F(\omega, \eta(\omega))$ a.s. by the definition of f .

Applying the preceding claim to $F(\omega, y) = G(\omega, \hat{x}, y)$ (see by Lemma 3.12 (i) and (ii)) and successively to $K = K(\omega, x_0, x_1)$ (recall that K is $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable by Lemma 3.10) and $K = \infty$ give us (43).

Step 4: Our considerations so far imply that the set $\{A(\cdot, q) = A^K(\cdot, q) \text{ for all } q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [x_0, x_1]\}$ has probability one. Fix some ω_0 in the intersection of this set with the ones where A is monotone and A^K is continuous (this intersection is again a set of full measure). For any $x \in [x_0, x_1]$, there exist some sequences $(q_n)_n, (r_n)_n \subset \mathbb{Q}$ such that $q_n \nearrow x$ and $r_n \searrow x$. As A is non-decreasing (see step 2), A has a left and right limit in (ω_0, x) :

$$\lim_{q_n \nearrow x} A(\omega_0, q_n) = A(\omega_0, x-) \text{ and } \lim_{r_n \searrow x} A(\omega_0, r_n) = A(\omega_0, x+).$$

As A^K is continuous (see step 1),

$$\lim_{q_n \nearrow x} A^K(\omega_0, q_n) = \lim_{r_n \searrow x} A^K(\omega_0, r_n) = A^K(\omega_0, x).$$

So by choice of ω_0 , $A(\omega_0, x-) = A(\omega_0, x+) = A^K(\omega_0, x)$ hence $\omega_0 \in \{A(\cdot, x) = A^K(\cdot, x) \text{ for all } x \in [x_0, x_1]\}$. Thus $P(A(\cdot, x) = A^K(\cdot, x) \text{ for all } x \in [x_0, x_1]) = 1$. $\square$

Lemma 3.15 *Let Assumptions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 hold. There is a set of full measure $\tilde{\Omega}$ and a $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable sequence $\xi_n(\omega, x) \in D$ such that $G(\omega, x, \xi_n(\omega, x))$ converges to $A(\omega, x)$ for all $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, for $(\omega, x) \in \tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$ define*

$$E_n(\omega, x) := |G(\omega, x, \xi_n(\omega, x)) - A(\omega, x)|. \quad (45)$$

For all $N > 0$ and for all $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$, $\sup_{|x| \leq N} E_n(\omega, x) \rightarrow 0$, $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Choose $\tilde{\Omega}$ such that all the conclusions of Lemmata 3.12, 3.13 and Remark 3.14 hold on this set.

Step 1: construction of the sequence $(\xi_n)_n$.

From Lemma 3.12 and a result of Castaing and Valadier [1977], page 70, we get that G is $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable. Note also that A is $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable since A is defined as a countable supremum. Let $q_1, \dots, q_k, \dots$ be an enumeration of $\mathbb{Q}^d$. Define $\mathbb{D}_n := \{l/2^n, l \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Let $C_1^n = \{(\omega, x) \in \tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{D}_n : |G(\omega, x, q_1) - A(\omega, x)| < 1/n\}$ and for all $k \geq 2$, define C_k^n recursively by

$$C_k^n = \{(\omega, x) \in \tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{D}_n : |G(\omega, x, q_k) - A(\omega, x)| < 1/n\} \setminus \bigcup_{l=1, \dots, k-1} C_l^n.$$

Then C_k^n is in $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ and, as $A(\omega, x) = \sup_k G(\omega, x, q_k)$, one has $\bigcup_k C_k^n = \tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{D}_n$.

Recall from Assumption 3.1 that, for almost all ω , $D(\omega)$ is a non-empty vector subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$ (and is thus closed). For all k , consider the projection $Q_k(\omega)$ of q_k on $D(\omega)$. Then $Q_k \in D$ and, as in Proposition 4.6 of Rásonyi and Stettner [2005], the measurable selection theorem (see for example Proposition III.44 in Dellacherie and Meyer [1979]) implies that the projection of any $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable (and a fortiori of any constant) is $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable. Define for $(\omega, x) \in \tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$

$$\xi_n(\omega, x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} Q_k(\omega) 1_{\{(\omega, l/2^n) \in C_k^n\}}(\omega) 1_{\{l/2^n \leq x < (l+1)/2^n\}}(x). \quad (46)$$

Then ξ_n is $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable. Fix some n, l and $x \in [l/2^n, (l+1)/2^n)$. Then one has a.s. on $\{\omega : (\omega, l/2^n) \in C_k^n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(\omega, x, \xi_n(\omega, x)) &= G(\omega, x, Q_k(\omega)) = E(V(x + Q_k(\omega)Y) | \mathcal{H}) \\ &= E(V(x + q_k Y) | \mathcal{H}) = G(\omega, x, q_k), \end{aligned}$$

because, from Remark 3.2, $q_k Y = Q_k Y$ a.s. As the C_k^n form a partition of $\tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{D}_n$, we have $|G(\omega, x, \xi_n(\omega, x)) - A(\omega, x)| < 1/n$, for all n and $(\omega, x) \in \tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{D}_n$.

Step 2: Convergence results.

Fix any integer $N > 0$, we will prove that for all $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$, $\sup_{|x| \leq N} E_n(\omega, x)$ goes to zero. We argue for each fixed $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$. As $A(\omega, x)$ is continuous from Lemma 3.13, it is uniformly continuous on $[-N, N]$. Hence for each $\epsilon > 0$ there is $\eta(\omega) > 0$ such that $|A(\omega, x) - A(\omega, y)| < \epsilon/2$ if $|x - y| < \eta(\omega)$. Now let $d_n(x)$ denote the element of $\mathbb{D}_n$ such that $d_n(x) \leq x < d_n(x) + (1/2^n)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |G(\omega, x, \xi_n(\omega, x)) - A(\omega, x)| &\leq |G(\omega, x, \xi_n(\omega, x)) - G(\omega, d_n(x), \xi_n(\omega, d_n(x)))| + \\ &\quad |G(\omega, d_n(x), \xi_n(\omega, d_n(x))) - A(\omega, d_n(x))| + \\ &\quad |A(\omega, d_n(x)) - A(\omega, x)| \\ &\leq 0 + 1/n + \epsilon/2 \leq \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

if n is chosen so large that $1/2^n < \eta(\omega)$ and $1/n < \epsilon/2$ both hold true. This concludes the proof. $\square$

These preparations allow us to prove the existence of an optimal strategy:

Proposition 3.16 *Let Assumptions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 hold. Then there exists an $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ -measurable $\tilde{\xi}(\omega, x) \in D$ such that*

$$v(\omega, x) = E(V(x + \tilde{\xi}(\omega, x)Y) | \mathcal{H}) \text{ a.s.} \quad (47)$$

Proof. Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$. From Lemmata 3.13 and 3.15, for all $x_0 \leq x < x_1 := x_0 + 1$, there exists a sequence $\xi_n(\omega, x) \in D$ such that $G(\omega, x, \xi_n(\omega, x))$ converges to $v(\omega, x)$ for all $\omega \in \tilde{\Omega}$ (recall that Lemma 3.13 allows us to choose a good version of v , which is equal to A). Take $K(x_0, x_1)$ from Lemma 3.10 and set $\xi'_n(x) := \xi_n(x) 1_{|\xi_n(x)| \leq K}$. From Lemma A.2 of Rásonyi and Stettner [2005] (see also Lemma 2 in Kabanov and Stricker [2001]), we find a random subsequence $\xi'_k(\omega, x)$ of $\xi'_n(\omega, x)$ converging to some $\tilde{\xi}(\omega, x)$ for all $x \in [x_0, x_1)$ (on $\tilde{\Omega}$) as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Here $\xi'_k(\omega, x) = \xi'_{n_k}(\omega, x) = \sum_{l \geq k} \xi'_l(\omega, x) 1_{\tilde{A}(l, k)}$, with $\tilde{A}(l, k) = \{(\omega, x) : n_k(\omega, x) = l\} \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$ and

$\cup_{l \geq k} \tilde{A}(l, k) = \tilde{\Omega} \times \mathbb{R}$. Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$ now. Define $A(l, k) := \{\omega : (\omega, x) \in \tilde{A}(l, k)\} \in \mathcal{H}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
E(V(x + \tilde{\xi}'_k(x)Y)|\mathcal{H}) &= \sum_{l \geq k} 1_{A(l, k)} E(V(x + \xi'_l(x)Y)|\mathcal{H}) \\
&\geq \sum_{l \geq k} 1_{A(l, k)} E(V(x + \xi_l(x)Y)|\mathcal{H}) \\
&\geq \sum_{l \geq k} 1_{A(l, k)} (v(\omega, x) - E_l(\omega, x)) \\
&\geq \sum_{l \geq k} 1_{A(l, k)} (v(\omega, x) - \sup_{m \geq k} E_m(\omega, x)) = v(\omega, x) - \sup_{m \geq k} E_m(\omega, x),
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where (48) will come from Corollary 6.3 (see the arguments below), the first inequality comes from Lemma 3.10 (see (26)) and the second one from Lemmata 3.13 (ii) and 3.15 (see (45)).

Here we applied Corollary 6.3 with $W = \sum_{l \geq k} 1_{A(l, k)} E(V(x + \xi'_l(x)Y)|\mathcal{H})$, $A_l = A(l, k)$, $l \geq k$ and $Z = V(x + \tilde{\xi}'_k(x)Y)$. By Remark 3.7, $E(Z1_{A_l}|\mathcal{H})$ exists and is a.s. finite. Since $W1_{A_l} = E(Z1_{A_l}|\mathcal{H})$ a.s. holds true trivially, (48) is satisfied.

Note that $E_m(\omega, x) \rightarrow 0$, $m \rightarrow \infty$ (see Lemma 3.15) also implies $\sup_{m \geq k} E_m(\omega, x) \rightarrow 0$, $k \rightarrow \infty$. As $E(V(x + \tilde{\xi}'_k(x)Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq E(V^+(x + K|Y||\mathcal{H})) < \infty$ by Assumption 3.6, the (limsup) Fatou Lemma applies and we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
E(V(x + \tilde{\xi}(x)Y)|\mathcal{H}) &\geq \limsup_k E(V(x + \tilde{\xi}'_k(x)Y)|\mathcal{H}) \\
&\geq \limsup_k (v(\omega, x) - \sup_{m \geq k} E_m(\omega, x)) = v(\omega, x).
\end{aligned}$$

and the result is proved for $x \in [x_0, x_1]$. Varying $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ we can easily extend the construction to the whole of $\mathbb{R}$. $\square$

Proposition 3.17 *Let Assumptions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 hold. The $\tilde{\xi}$ constructed in the proof of Lemma 3.16 satisfies*

$$v(\omega, H) = E(V(H + \tilde{\xi}(H)Y)|\mathcal{H}) = \text{ess. sup}_{\xi \in \Xi} E(V(H + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \text{ a.s.}, \tag{49}$$

for each $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variable H .

Proof. We will prove that the following inequalities hold true:

$$v(\omega, H) \leq E(V(H + \tilde{\xi}(H)Y)|\mathcal{H}) \text{ a.s.} \tag{50}$$

and for any fixed ξ

$$E(V(H + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq v(\omega, H) \text{ a.s.} \tag{51}$$

Then from (50) and (51) applied to $\tilde{\xi}(H)$, we get that $v(\omega, H) = E(V(H + \tilde{\xi}(H)Y)|\mathcal{H})$ a.s. So $v(\omega, H) = E(V(H + \tilde{\xi}(H)Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq \text{ess. sup}_{\xi \in \Xi} E(V(H + \xi Y)|\mathcal{H}) \leq v(\omega, H)$ a.s. (where the last inequality comes from (51) again) and Proposition 3.17 is proved.

Step 1: It is enough to prove (50) for bounded H .

As $H = \sum_{p=-\infty}^{\infty} H 1_{p \leq H < p+1}$, we want to apply Corollary 6.3 to $W = v(\cdot, H)$, $A_p = \{p \leq H < p+1\}$ and $Z = V(H + \tilde{\xi}(H)Y)$ to conclude that if (50) is proved for each $H_p = H 1_{p \leq H < p+1}$ then it is proved for H . We only need to verify that $E(V(H + \tilde{\xi}(H)Y)1_{A_p}|\mathcal{H})$ exists and it is finite a.s., but this is clear from Remark 3.7.

Step 2: Proof of (50) for bounded H .

First let us fix $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $p \leq |H| < p+1$. Let us also fix n . We will establish that

$$v(\omega, H) - \tilde{E}_{n,p}(\omega) \leq E(V(H + \xi'_n(H)Y)|\mathcal{H}) \text{ a.s.} \tag{52}$$

where $\tilde{E}_{n,p} := \sup_{p \leq x < p+1} E_n(\omega, x)$ (E_n is defined in (45) above) and $\xi'_n := \xi_n 1_{|\xi_n| \leq K(p,p+1)}$ (ξ_n is defined in Lemma 3.15 and K in Lemma 3.10).

As $H = \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} H 1_{\{H \in [l/2^n, (l+1)/2^n]\}}$, applying Corollary 6.3 again, it is enough to prove (52) for $J^l = H 1_{\{H \in [l/2^n, (l+1)/2^n]\}}$ for each $l = p2^n, \dots, (p+1)2^n - 1$.

Fix $l \in \{p2^n, \dots, (p+1)2^n - 1\}$. Fix some step functions $J_k^l = \sum_{m \geq 1} j_m^{k,l} 1_{J_k^l = j_m^{k,l}}$ converging to J^l , $k \rightarrow \infty$, such that $j_m^{k,l} \in [l/2^n, (l+1)/2^n]$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E(V(j_m^{k,l} + \xi'_n(j_m^{k,l})Y)|\mathcal{H}) &\geq E(V(j_m^{k,l} + \xi_n(j_m^{k,l})Y)|\mathcal{H}) \\ &\geq (v(\omega, j_m^{k,l}) - \tilde{E}_{n,p}(\omega)), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality comes from Lemma 3.10 (see (26)), the second one from Lemmata 3.13 (ii) and 3.15 (see (45)). So (52) holds for each $H = j_m^{k,l}$ and, applying Corollary 6.3, (52) holds also for $H = J_k^l$.

By the construction of ξ_n (see (46)), we have that $\xi'_n(x)$ is constant for $x \in [l/2^n, (l+1)/2^n]$ and thus $\xi'_n(J_k^l) = \xi'_n(J^l)$. So using the continuity of v on the left-hand side, the continuity of V and Fatou Lemma for the right-hand side, we get that (52) holds for each J^l and the statement (52) is proved. Here we can use the limsup Fatou Lemma because $V(J_k^l + \tilde{\xi}(J_k^l)Y) \leq V^+(p+1+K(p,p+1)|Y|)$ and the latter is $< \infty$ a.s. due to Assumption 3.6.

Now we pass to the limit in (52) along the random subsequence n_k of Proposition 3.16 (again, (52) holds for n_k by Corollary 6.3). From Lemma 3.15, $\tilde{E}_{n_k,p} \rightarrow 0$ a.s. As from Proposition 3.16, $\xi'_{n_k}(\omega, x)$ converge to $\tilde{\xi}(\omega, x)$ for all x , $\xi'_{n_k}(\omega, H(\omega))$ converge to $\tilde{\xi}(x, H(\omega))$ and using the same Fatou-lemma argument, we get that (50) holds true.

Step 3: Proof of (51).

Similarly as in step 1, it is enough to prove (51) for bounded H and ξ . We denote by N the bound on $|\xi|$ and by M the bound on $|H|$. By definition of v , (51) holds true for constant H , so by Corollary 6.3 it holds true for step functions H . Again, taking a sequence of step-function approximations $H_l \rightarrow H$ with H_l uniformly bounded, using the continuity of v for the right-hand side and Fatou Lemma for the left-hand side (here it is liminf Fatou Lemma and we use that $V(H_l + \xi Y) \geq -V^-(-M - N|Y|)$ and $E(V^-(-M - N|Y|)|\mathcal{H}) < \infty$ due to Assumption 3.5), we get that (51) holds for all bounded H and ξ and the statement is proved. $\square$

4 Dynamic programming

We are now able to perform a dynamic programming argument. We need to establish that some crucial properties of U are true for U_t as well, i.e. they are preserved by dynamic programming. In particular the “asymptotic elasticity”-type conditions (53) and (54), see below.

Proposition 4.1 *Assume that U satisfies Assumption 2.4. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda \geq 1$,*

$$U(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} U(x) + C \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} \quad (53)$$

$$U(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} U(x) + C \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}}. \quad (54)$$

Proof. Let $C := \max(U(\bar{x}), -U(-\underline{x})) + c \geq 0$. Obviously, (53) holds true for $x \geq \bar{x}$ by (2). For $0 \leq x \leq \bar{x}$, as U is nondecreasing, we get

$$U(\lambda x) \leq U(\lambda \bar{x}) \leq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} U(\bar{x}) + c,$$

from (2) and (53) holds true. Now, for $-\underline{x} < x \leq 0$,

$$\lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} U(x) + C \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} \geq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} U(-\underline{x}) + C \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}}$$

and (53) holds true since $C \geq -U(-\underline{x})$ and $U(\lambda x) \leq 0$.

If $x \leq -\underline{x}$, $U(x) \leq 0$. By (3) and $\bar{\gamma} < \underline{\gamma}$, one has

$$U(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} U(x) \leq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} U(x) \leq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} U(x) + \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} C.$$

We now turn to the proof of (54). For $x > 0$, using (53), $\bar{\gamma} < \underline{\gamma}$ and $U(x) \geq 0$:

$$U(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} U(x) + C \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} \leq \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} U(x) + C \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}}.$$

For $-\underline{x} < x \leq 0$

$$\lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} U(x) + C \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} \geq \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} U(-\underline{x}) + C \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} \geq 0 \geq U(\lambda x),$$

since $C \geq -U(-\underline{x})$. Finally, (54) for $x \leq -\underline{x}$ follows directly from (3). $\square$

Proposition 4.2 *Assume that S satisfies the (NA) condition. Then, for all $t = 1, \dots, T$, D_t satisfies Assumption 3.1.*

Proof. By Proposition A.1 of Rásonyi and Stettner [2005] (condition (NA) is not necessary at this point), $D_t \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{H}$ and for almost all ω , $D_t(\omega)$ is an affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$. From Theorem 3 of Jacod and Shiryaev [1998], under condition (NA), $D_t(\omega)$ is, in fact, a non-empty vector subspace of $\mathbb{R}^d$, for almost all ω . $\square$

Proposition 4.3 *Assume that S satisfies the (NA) condition and that Assumptions 2.4 and 2.8 hold true. The functions U_t , $0 \leq t \leq T$ have versions, which are almost surely nondecreasing, continuous, finite and satisfy*

$$U_t(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} U_t(x) + C \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}}, \quad (55)$$

$$U_t(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} U_t(x) + C \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}}. \quad (56)$$

Moreover, there exist $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ -measurable random variables $N_{t-1} > 0$ such that:

$$P\left(U_t(-N_{t-1}) < -\frac{2C}{\kappa_{t-1}} - 1 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}\right) \geq 1 - \kappa_{t-1}/2. \quad (57)$$

Finally, there exist functions $\tilde{\xi}_{t+1} \in \Xi_t$ taking values in D_{t+1} , $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ such that

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R} \quad U_t(\omega, x) = E(U_{t+1}(x + \tilde{\xi}_{t+1}(x) \Delta S_{t+1}) | \mathcal{F}_t). \quad (58)$$

Proof. Going backwards from T to 0, we will apply Lemmata 3.10 and 3.13 and Propositions 3.16 and 3.17 with the choice $V := U_t$, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_t$, $D := D_t$, $Y := \Delta S_t$. We need to verify that Assumptions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 hold true.

We start by the ones which can be verified directly for all t . The price process S satisfies the (NA) condition. So by Proposition 2.2, Assumption 3.3 holds true with $\alpha = \delta_{t-1}$ and $\beta = \kappa_{t-1}$. Moreover, by Proposition 4.2, D_t satisfies Assumption 3.1. Assumptions 3.5 and 3.6 follow from Assumption 2.8, by Lemma 2.10 (see (16) and (17)).

It remains to prove that Assumptions 3.4, 3.8 and 3.9 hold. We start at time $t = T$. The function $U_T = U$ is continuous and non-decreasing by Assumption 2.4, so Assumption 3.4 holds. Equations (21) and (22) for $V = U_T$ follow from Proposition 4.1, so Assumption 3.8 holds. Assumption 3.9 is satisfied because from (3), for any $x \geq \underline{x}$,

$$U(-x) \leq \left(\frac{x}{\underline{x}}\right)^{\underline{\gamma}} U(-\underline{x})$$

and by (4), $U(-\underline{x}) < 0$: we may choose $N_{T-1} := \underline{x} \left(\frac{-(2C/\kappa_{T-1})-1}{U(-\underline{x})}\right)^{\frac{1}{\underline{\gamma}}}$.

So we are able to use Proposition 3.16 and there exists a function $\tilde{\xi}_T$ with values in D_T such that (58) holds. Moreover, by Lemmata 3.10 and 3.13, $U_{T-1}(\omega, \cdot)$ is a nondecreasing (finite-valued) continuous function hence Assumption 3.4 holds for U_{T-1} . We now prove that (53), (54) and thus Assumption 3.8 hold for $V = U_{T-1}$.

$$\begin{aligned} U_{T-1}(\lambda x) &= E(U_T(\lambda x + \tilde{\xi}_T(\lambda x) \Delta S_T) | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}) \\ &\leq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} (E(U_T(x + (\tilde{\xi}_T(\lambda x)/\lambda) \Delta S_T) | \mathcal{F}_{T-1}) + C) \\ &\leq \lambda^{\bar{\gamma}} (U_{T-1}(x) + C), \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from (53) for U_T . Thus (53) holds for U_{T-1} . By the same argument, (54) also holds for U_{T-1} .

It remains to show that Assumption 3.9 holds for U_{T-1} . Choosing $I_{T-1} = 2C/\kappa_{T-1} + 1$ in Lemma 3.10, there exists some non negative and $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable random variable N' such that $U_{T-1}(-N') \leq -I_{T-1}$ a.s. Trivially, as $P(N' \leq n|\mathcal{F}_{T-2})$ goes to 1 when $n \rightarrow \infty$, there exists some non-negative and $\mathcal{F}_{T-2}$ -measurable random variable N_{T-2} such that $P(N' \leq N_{T-2}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) \geq 1 - \kappa_{T-2}/2$. Then

$$P(U_{T-1}(-N_{T-2}) < -I_{T-1}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) \geq P(\{N' \leq N_{T-2}\} \cap \{U_{T-1}(-N') < -I_{T-1}\}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) \geq 1 - \kappa_{T-2}/2.$$

We are now able to use Proposition 3.16 for U_{T-1} and continue the procedure of dynamic programming in an analogous way. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 2.11. Set $\phi_1^* := \tilde{\xi}_1(x)$ and define inductively:

$$\phi_t^* := \tilde{\xi}_t \left(x + \sum_{j=1}^{t-1} \phi_j^* \Delta S_j \right), \quad 1 \leq t \leq T.$$

Joint measurability of $\tilde{\xi}_t$ assures that ϕ^* is a predictable process with respect to the given filtration. Propositions 4.3 and 3.17 show

$$E(U_t(V_t^{x,\phi^*})|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = U_{t-1}(V_{t-1}^{x,\phi^*}) \quad (59)$$

for $t = 1, \dots, T$.

We will now show that if $EU(V_T^{x,\phi^*})$ exists then $\phi^* \in \Phi(U, x)$ and for any strategy $\phi \in \Phi(U, x)$,

$$E(U(V_T^{x,\phi})) \leq E(U(V_T^{x,\phi^*})). \quad (60)$$

This will conclude the proof.

Let us consider first the case where $EU^+(V_T^{x,\phi^*}) < \infty$. Then by (59) and the (conditional) Jensen inequality (see Corollary 6.6),

$$U_{T-1}^+(V_{T-1}^{x,\phi^*}) \leq E(U_T^+(V_T^{x,\phi^*})|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}).$$

Thus $E[U_{T-1}^+(V_{T-1}^{x,\phi^*})] < \infty$ and repeating the argument, $E[U_t^+(V_t^{x,\phi^*})] < \infty$ for all t .

Now let us turn to the case where $EU^-(V_T^{x,\phi^*}) < \infty$. The same argument as above with negative parts instead of positive parts shows that $E[U_t^-(V_t^{x,\phi^*})] < \infty$, for all t .

It follows that, for all t , $EU_t(V_t^{x,\phi^*})$ exists and so does $E(U_t(V_t^{x,\phi^*})|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$ by Lemma 6.2. This Lemma also implies that $E(E(U_t(V_t^{x,\phi^*})|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})) = EU_t(V_t^{x,\phi^*})$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} E(U_T(V_T^{x,\phi^*})) &= E(E(U_T(V_T^{x,\phi^*})|\mathcal{F}_{T-1})) = E(U_{T-1}(V_{T-1}^{x,\phi^*})) \\ &= \dots = E(U_0(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

By (7) and (13), $-\infty < U(x) \leq EU_0(x) < \infty$, hence also $E(U_T(V_T^{x,\phi^*}))$ is finite and $\phi^* \in \Phi(U, x)$ follows.

Let $\phi \in \Phi(U, x)$, then $E(U(V_T^{x,\phi}))$ exists and is finite by definition of $\Phi(U, x)$. By Lemma 6.2, we have that, for all t , $E(U(V_T^{x,\phi})|\mathcal{F}_t)$ exists and that $E(E(U(V_T^{x,\phi})|\mathcal{F}_t)) = E(U(V_T^{x,\phi}))$.

We prove by induction that $E(U(V_T^{x,\phi})|\mathcal{F}_t) \leq U_t(V_t^{x,\phi})$ a.s. For $t = T$, this is trivial. Assume that it holds true for $t + 1$. By (14) and (15), $E(U_{t+1}^\pm(V_t^{x,\phi} + \phi_{t+1}\Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) < +\infty$ and $E(U_{t+1}(V_t^{x,\phi} + \phi_{t+1}\Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t)$ exists and it is finite. So, by the induction hypothesis and Proposition 3.17,

$$E(U(V_T^{x,\phi})|\mathcal{F}_t) \leq E(U_{t+1}(V_t^{x,\phi} + \phi_{t+1}\Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) \leq E(U_{t+1}(V_t^{x,\phi} + \tilde{\xi}_{t+1}(V_t^{x,\phi})\Delta S_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t) = U_t(V_t^{x,\phi}).$$

Applying the result at $t = 0$, we obtain that $E(U(V_T^{x,\phi})|\mathcal{F}_0) \leq U_0(x)$. Using again $-\infty < U(x) \leq EU_0(x) < \infty$ (see (7) and (13)), we obtain that

$$E(U(V_T^{x,\phi})) \leq E(U_0(x)). \quad (62)$$

Putting (61) and (62) together, one gets exactly (60). $\square$

We would like to check that Theorem 2.11 holds in a concrete, broad class of market models. Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the set of $\mathbb{R}$ -valued random variables Y such that $E|Y|^p < \infty$ for all $p > 0$. This family is clearly closed under addition, multiplication and taking conditional expectation. With a slight abuse of notation, for a d -dimensional random variable Y , we write $Y \in \mathcal{M}$ when we indeed mean $|Y| \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 4.4 *Let Assumption 2.4 hold and assume that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $U(x) \geq -m(|x|^p + 1)$ holds for some $m, p > 0$. Furthermore, assume that for all $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have $\Delta S_t \in \mathcal{M}$ and that (NA) holds with δ_t, κ_t of Proposition 2.2 satisfying $1/\delta_t, 1/\kappa_t \in \mathcal{M}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T-1$. Then Assumption 2.8 is satisfied and there is $\phi^* \in \Phi(U, x)$ such that*

$$EU(V_T^{x, \phi^*}) = \sup_{\phi \in \Phi(U, x)} EU(V_T^{x, \phi}).$$

Remark 4.5 In the light of Proposition 2.2, $1/\delta_t, 1/\kappa_t \in \mathcal{M}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ is a certain strong form of no-arbitrage. Note that if either κ_t or δ_t is not constant, then even a concave utility maximisation problem may be ill posed (see Example 3.3 in Carassus and Rásonyi [2007]), so an integrability assumption on $1/\delta_t, 1/\kappa_t$ looks reasonable.

When S has independent increments and (NA) holds then one can choose $\kappa_t = \kappa$, and $\beta_t = \beta$ in Proposition 2.2 with deterministic constants $\kappa, \beta > 0$, and these trivially satisfy $1/\delta_t, 1/\kappa_t \in \mathcal{M}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T-1$.

Finally, the assumption that $\Delta S_{t+1}, 1/\delta_t, 1/\kappa_t \in \mathcal{M}$ for $0 \leq t \leq T-1$ could be weakened to the existence of the N th moment for N large enough but this would lead to complicated book-keeping with no essential gain in generality, which we prefer to avoid.

Proof. We will sketch the arguments, which closely follow the proof of Proposition 4.3. Clearly, (12) is implied by our assumptions. Hence in order to prove that Assumption 2.8 holds true, it remains to check (13). Fix $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d$. We prove by induction, that the functions U_t , $0 \leq t \leq T$ have versions, which are almost surely nondecreasing, continuous, finite and satisfy

$$U_t(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\overline{\gamma}} U_t(x) + C \lambda^{\overline{\gamma}}, \quad (63)$$

$$U_t(\lambda x) \leq \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}} U_t(x) + C \lambda^{\underline{\gamma}}. \quad (64)$$

There exist some $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ -measurable random variables $N_{t-1} > 0$ belonging to $\mathcal{M}$ such that:

$$P(U_t(-N_{t-1}) < -(2C/\kappa_{t-1}) - 1 | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \geq 1 - \kappa_{t-1}/2, \quad (65)$$

Finally, there exists some random variables C_t, J_{t-1}, M_t belonging to $\mathcal{M}$, such that C_t, M_t are $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable, J_{t-1} is $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ -measurable and some numbers $\theta_t > 0$ such that

$$U_t(x) \leq C_t(|x|^{\overline{\gamma}} + 1), \quad (66)$$

$$E(U_t(x + |y| |\Delta S_t|) | \mathcal{F}_{t-1}) \leq J_{t-1}(|x|^{\overline{\gamma}} + |y|^{\overline{\gamma}} + 1) < \infty \quad (67)$$

$$\tilde{K}_t(x) \leq M_t(|x|^{\theta_t} + 1), \quad (68)$$

where the $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable random variable $\tilde{K}_t$ is defined in Lemma 3.10 for $V = U_{t+1}$ and is a bound for $|\tilde{\xi}(x)|$. Note that (68) will be proved for $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ while (66) and (67) for $t = 0, \dots, T$.

Then this will imply that the $U_t(x)$ are well defined for all x , that (17) holds and that at time $t = 0$, (13) is satisfied, which will finish the proof of Proposition 4.4. To carry out this programme, we will refine the proof of Proposition 4.3 and, going backwards from T to 0 , we will apply Lemmata 3.10, 3.13 and Propositions 3.16, 3.17 with the choice $V := U_t$, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_t$, $D := D_t$, $Y := \Delta S_t$. We need to verify that Assumptions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 hold true.

As before we start by the ones which can be verified directly for all t . The price process S satisfies (NA) condition. So by Proposition 2.2, Assumption 3.3 holds true with $\alpha = \delta_{t-1}$ and

$\beta = \kappa_{t-1}$. Moreover, by Proposition 4.2, D_t satisfies Assumption 3.1. Assumption 3.5 follows from (12), by Lemma 2.7 (see (8)) and a proof similar to that of Lemma 2.10.

(68) for $t = 0, \dots, T-1$ will be a consequence of (65) and (67) for $t+1 \in \{1, \dots, T\}$. Recall (see Remark 3.11) that $\tilde{K}_t$ is a polynomial function of x^+ , $\frac{1}{\delta_t}$, $\frac{1}{\kappa_t}$, N_t , $[E(U_{t+1}(-x^-)|\mathcal{F}_t)]^-$ and L_{t+1} , where L_{t+1} equals L figuring in the proof of Lemma 3.10, for the choice $V = U_{t+1}$. By (7), $U_{t+1}(-x^-) \geq U(-x^-)$ and $[E(U_{t+1}(-x^-)|\mathcal{F}_t)]^- \leq E(U^+(-x^-)|\mathcal{F}_t) \leq m(|x|^p + 1)$ by the assumptions of Proposition 4.4. So $\tilde{K}_t$ is a polynomial function in x . It remains to show that M_t is in $\mathcal{M}$ (it will be clear that M_t is $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable). Recall that $L_{t+1} = E(U_{t+1}^+(1 + |\Delta S_{t+1}|)|\mathcal{F}_t) \leq 3J_t$ by (67) for $t+1$. So we get that L_{t+1} belongs to $\mathcal{M}$. We have assumed that $\frac{1}{\delta_t}$ and $\frac{1}{\kappa_t}$ belong to $\mathcal{M}$, so (68) will be proved as soon as $N_t \in \mathcal{M}$ which is given by Assumption 3.9 for $V = U_{t+1}$ (and (65) for $t+1$).

So it remains to prove that Assumptions 3.4, 3.6, 3.8 and 3.9 hold. First we look at $V = U_T$. Assumptions 3.4 and 3.8 are clear from Assumption 2.4.

As $|x+y|^{\bar{\gamma}} \leq 2^{\bar{\gamma}}(|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + |y|^{\bar{\gamma}})$, we estimate

$$\begin{aligned} U(x) &\leq \frac{|x|^{\bar{\gamma}}}{\bar{x}^{\bar{\gamma}}} U(\bar{x}) + c + U(\bar{x}) := C_T(|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1), \\ E(U(x+y|\Delta S_T)|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) &\leq E(C_T|\mathcal{F}_{T-1})(2^{\bar{\gamma}}|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1) + 2^{\bar{\gamma}}|y|^{\bar{\gamma}} E(C_T|\Delta S_T|^{\bar{\gamma}}|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) \\ &\leq J_{T-1}(|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + |y|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that C_T and J_{T-1} belong to $\mathcal{M}$ (recall $\Delta S_T \in \mathcal{M}$) and that C_T is $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable (in fact, it is a constant here) and J_{T-1} is $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable. Thus (66) and (67) hold true for $t = T$. As Assumption 3.5 holds true, (67) for $t = T$ shows that Assumption 3.6 holds true for $t = T$. Choosing $N_{T-1} := \underline{x} \left(\frac{-(2C/\kappa_{T-1})-1}{U(-\underline{x})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ just like in the proof of Proposition 4.3 we can see that $N_{T-1} \in \mathcal{M}$ and hence Assumption 3.9 holds true for $V = U_T$ (and (65) for $t = T$). Let us now proceed to $V = U_{T-1}$.

By Lemmata 3.10 and 3.13 for $V = U_{T-1}$, $U_{T-1}(\omega, \cdot)$ is a nondecreasing (finite-valued) continuous function hence Assumption 3.4 holds for U_{T-1} . By (25)

$$\begin{aligned} U_{T-1}(x) &\leq E(U_T(|x| + \tilde{K}_{T-1}(|x| + 1)|\Delta S_T)|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) \\ &\leq E(C_T(|x| + \tilde{K}_{T-1}(|x| + 1)|\Delta S_T|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1)|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) \\ &\leq E\left(C_T\left(2^{\bar{\gamma}}|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 2^{2\bar{\gamma}}\tilde{K}_{T-1}^{\bar{\gamma}}(|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1)|\Delta S_T|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1\right)|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}\right) \\ &= |x|^{\bar{\gamma}}\left(2^{\bar{\gamma}}E(C_T|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) + 2^{2\bar{\gamma}}\tilde{K}_{T-1}^{\bar{\gamma}}E(|\Delta S_T|^{\bar{\gamma}}|\mathcal{F}_{T-1})\right) \\ &\quad + E(C_T|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) + 2^{2\bar{\gamma}}\tilde{K}_{T-1}^{\bar{\gamma}}E(C_T|\Delta S_T|^{\bar{\gamma}}|\mathcal{F}_{T-1}) \\ &\leq C_{T-1}(|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1). \end{aligned}$$

As C_{T-1} is $\mathcal{F}_{T-1}$ -measurable, it remains to show that C_{T-1} belongs to $\mathcal{M}$. This holds true since $\tilde{K}_{T-1}$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}$ by (68) for $t = T-1$ (as mentioned before, it is a consequence of (65) and (67) for $t = T$). Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} E(U_{T-1}(x + |y||\Delta S_{T-1}|)|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) &\leq E(C_{T-1}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2})(2^{\bar{\gamma}}|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1) + \\ &\quad 2^{\bar{\gamma}}|y|^{\bar{\gamma}} E(C_{T-1}|\Delta S_{T-1}|^{\bar{\gamma}}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) \\ &\leq J_{T-2}(|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + |y|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

As J_{T-2} clearly belongs to $\mathcal{M}$ and J_{T-2} is $\mathcal{F}_{T-2}$ -measurable, (67) is proved for $t = T-1$. As Assumption 3.5 holds true, (67) for $t = T-1$ shows that Assumption 3.6 holds true for $t = T-1$.

Just like in the proof of Proposition 4.3, we can show that (63), (64) for $t = T-1$ and thus Assumption 3.8 hold true for $V = U_{T-1}$. It remains to establish the existence of $N_{T-2} \in \mathcal{M}$, i.e. (65) for $t = T-1$ and Assumption 3.9 for $V = U_{T-1}$. The random variable N' constructed in the proof of Lemma 3.10 is such that $U_{T-1}(-N') \leq -I_{T-1}$, where $I_{T-1} = (2C/\kappa_{T-1}) + 1$. By (37), N' is a polynomial function of $\frac{1}{\kappa_{T-1}}$, N_{T-1} (which both belong to $\mathcal{M}$)

and $E(U^+(\tilde{K}_{T-1}|\Delta S_T)|\mathcal{F}_{T-1})$ which is bounded by $J_{T-1}(0 + \tilde{K}_{T-1}^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1)$. Hence N' belongs to $\mathcal{M}$ by (68) for $t = T - 1$. Let us now choose

$$N_{T-2} := \frac{2E(N'|\mathcal{F}_{T-2})}{\kappa_{T-2}} \in \mathcal{M}.$$

The (conditional) Markov inequality implies that

$$P(N' > N_{T-2}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) \leq \frac{E(N'|\mathcal{F}_{T-2})}{N_{T-2}} = \frac{\kappa_{T-2}}{2}.$$

As in the proof of Proposition 4.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} P(U_{T-1}(-N_{T-2}) \leq -I_{T-1}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) &\geq P(\{N' \leq N_{T-2}\} \cap \{U_{T-1}(-N') < -I_{T-1}\}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) \\ &\geq P(\{N' \leq N_{T-2}\}|\mathcal{F}_{T-2}) \geq 1 - \kappa_{T-2}/2. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof that Assumption 2.8 is satisfied since

$$EU_0(x) \leq (|x|^{\bar{\gamma}} + 1)EC_0 < \infty.$$

By (68), $|\tilde{\xi}_t(x)| \leq M_{t-1}(1 + |x|^{\theta_{t-1}})$ hence an inductive argument shows $\phi_t^* \in \mathcal{M}$ and $V_t^{x, \phi^*} \in \mathcal{M}$ for all t . By (69), one has

$$EU(V_T^{x, \phi^*}) \leq U(\bar{x}) + E\left(\frac{|V_T^{x, \phi^*}|}{\bar{x}}\right)^{\bar{\gamma}} U(\bar{x}) + c < \infty,$$

hence Theorem 2.11 applies and this finishes the proof. $\square$

5 Conclusions

One may try to prove a result similar to Theorem 2.11 in continuous-time models. Theorem 3.2 of Jin and Zhou [2008] implies, however, that taking $U(x) = x^\alpha$, $x > 0$ and $U(x) = -(-x)^\beta$, $x \leq 0$ with $0 < \alpha, \beta \leq 1$ the utility maximisation problem becomes ill-posed even in the simplest Black and Scholes model. On one hand, this shows that there is a fairly limited scope for the extension of our results to continuous-time market models unless the set of strategies is severely restricted (as in Berkelaar et al. [2004] and Carlier and Dana [2011]). On the other hand, this underlines the versatility and power of discrete-time modeling. The advantageous properties present in the discrete-time setting do not always carry over to the continuous-time case which is only an idealization of the real trading mechanism.

6 Appendix

Let W be a non-negative random variable on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, P)$. Let $\mathcal{H} \subset \mathfrak{F}$ be a sigma-algebra. Define (as in e.g. Dellacherie and Meyer [1979]), the generalized conditional expectation by

$$E(W|\mathcal{H}) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(W \wedge n|\mathcal{H}),$$

where the limit a.s. exists by monotonicity (but may be $+\infty$). In particular, EW is defined (finite or infinite). Note that if $EW < +\infty$, then the generalized and the usual conditional expectations of W coincide.

Lemma 6.1 *For all $A \in \mathcal{H}$ and all non-negative random variables W , the following equalities hold a.s.*

$$E(1_A E(W|\mathcal{H})) = E(W 1_A) \tag{69}$$

$$E(W 1_A|\mathcal{H}) = E(W|\mathcal{H}) 1_A. \tag{70}$$

Furthermore, $E(W|\mathcal{H}) < +\infty$ a.s. if and only if there is a sequence $A_m \in \mathcal{H}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E(W 1_{A_m}) < \infty$ for all m and $\cup_m A_m = \Omega$. In this case, $E(W|\mathcal{H})$ is the Radon-Nykodim derivative of the sigma-finite measure $\mu(A) := E(W 1_A)$, $A \in \mathcal{H}$ with respect to $P|_{\mathcal{H}}$.

Proof. Most of these facts are stated in section II.39 on page 33 of Dellacherie and Meyer [1979]. We nevertheless give a quick proof for the sake of completeness. Let $A \in \mathcal{H}$ arbitrary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} E(1_A E(W|\mathcal{H})) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E(1_A E(W \wedge n|\mathcal{H})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} E((W \wedge n)1_A) = E(W1_A) \end{aligned}$$

by monotone convergence and by the properties of ordinary conditional expectations. Similarly, (70) is satisfied by monotone convergence and by the properties of ordinary conditional expectations.

Now, if A_m is a sequence as in the statement of Lemma 6.1, then μ is indeed sigma-finite and (69) implies that $E(W|\mathcal{H})$ is the Radon-Nykodim derivative of μ with respect to $P|_{\mathcal{H}}$ and as such, it is a.s. finite.

Conversely, if $E(W|\mathcal{H}) < +\infty$ a.s. then define $A_m := \{E(W|\mathcal{H}) \leq m\}$. We have, by (69),

$$E(W1_{A_m}) = E(1_{A_m} E(W|\mathcal{H})) \leq m < \infty,$$

showing the existence of a suitable sequence A_m . $\square$

For a real-valued random variable Z we may define, if either $E(Z^+|\mathcal{H}) < \infty$ a.s. or $E(Z^-|\mathcal{H}) < \infty$ a.s.,

$$E(Z|\mathcal{H}) := E(Z^+|\mathcal{H}) - E(Z^-|\mathcal{H}).$$

In particular, $E(Z)$ is defined if either $E(Z^+) < +\infty$ or $E(Z^-) < +\infty$.

Lemma 6.2 *If $E(Z)$ is defined then so is $E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ and $E(Z) = E(E(Z|\mathcal{H}))$.*

Proof. We may suppose that e.g. $E(Z^+) < \infty$. Then $E(Z^+|\mathcal{H})$ exists (in the ordinary sense as well) and is finite, so $E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ exists. Then by (69), we have $E(Z^\pm) = E(E(Z^\pm|\mathcal{H}))$ (note that this last equality holds true for Z^+ by the properties of ordinary conditional expectations as well). $\square$

Corollary 6.3 *Let Z be a random variable and let W be a $\mathcal{H}$ -measurable random variable. Assume that there is a sequence $A_m \in \mathcal{H}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\cup_m A_m = \Omega$ and $E(Z1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})$ exists and it is finite. Then*

- (i) $E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ exists and it is finite.
- (ii) If $W1_{A_m} \leq E(Z1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})$ a.s. for all m then $W \leq E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ a.s.
- (iii) If $W1_{A_m} = E(Z1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})$ a.s. for all m then $W = E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ a.s.

This corollary applies, in particular, when $E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ is known to exist and to be finite.

Remark 6.4 As in (ii) or (iii) for all m , $W1_{A_m} \leq E(Z1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})$ a.s. and $E(Z1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H}) < \infty$, W is finite a.s.

Proof. Fix some m such that $E(Z1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})$ exists and it is finite, then $E(|Z|1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})$ is also finite and by Lemma 6.1 there exists a sequence $(B_j^m)_j$ such that $\cup_j B_j^m = \Omega$ and $E(|Z|1_{A_m}1_{B_j^m}) < \infty$ for all j .

Then the sets $C(m, j) := A_m \cap B_j^m$ are such that $\cup_{m,j} C(m, j) = \Omega$. Let $C_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$ be the enumeration of all the sets $C(m, j)$. We clearly have $E(|Z|1_{C_n}) < \infty$ for all n . Hence, by Lemma 6.1, $E(|Z||\mathcal{H}) < \infty$ and thus $E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ exist and are finite a.s.

Suppose that, e.g., $\{W > E(Z|\mathcal{H})\}$ on a set of positive measure. Then there is n such that $G := C_n \cap \{W > E(Z|\mathcal{H})\}$ has positive measure. There is also m such that $C_n \subset A_m$. Then $E(|Z|1_G) \leq E(|Z|1_{C_n}) < \infty$ and

$$E(E(Z|\mathcal{H})1_G) = E(E(Z1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})1_G) \geq E(W1_{A_m}1_G) = E(W1_G),$$

but this contradicts the choice of G , showing $W \leq E(Z|\mathcal{H})$. Arguing similarly for $\{W < E(Z|\mathcal{H})\}$ we can get (iii) as well. $\square$

Lemma 6.5 *Let Z_n be a sequence of random variables with $|Z_n| \leq W$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ converging to Z a.s. If $E(W|\mathcal{H}) < \infty$ a.s. then $E(Z_n|\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ a.s.*

Proof. Let $A_m \in \mathcal{H}$ be a partition of Ω such that $E(W1_{A_m}) < \infty$ for all m . Fixing m , the statement follows on A_m by the ordinary conditional Lebesgue theorem. Thus it holds on the whole of Ω since the A_m form a partition. $\square$

Proposition 6.6 *Let $g : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be convex and let $E(Z|\mathcal{H})$ exist and be finite. Then*

$$E(g(Z)|\mathcal{H}) \geq g(E(Z|\mathcal{H})) \text{ a.s.}$$

Proof. We may and will assume $g(0) = 0$. Define $B := \{E(g(Z)|\mathcal{H}) < \infty\}$. The inequality is trivial on the complement of B .

From Lemma 6.1, let A_m be a sequence such that $\cup_m A_m = \Omega$ and $E(|Z|1_{A_m}) < \infty$, $E(g(Z)1_{A_m}1_B) < \infty$ hold for all m . From the ordinary Jensen inequality we clearly have

$$1_B E(g(Z)1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H}) = E(g(Z)1_{A_m}1_B|\mathcal{H}) \geq g(E(Z)1_{A_m}1_B|\mathcal{H})) = g(E(Z|\mathcal{H}))1_{A_m}1_B$$

for all m , and the statement follows if we can apply Corollary 6.3, i.e. if $E(g(Z)1_{A_m}|\mathcal{H})$ exists and it is finite a.s. This holds true by the choice of A_m . $\square$

References

- M. Allais. Le comportement de l'homme rationnel devant le risque : critique des postulats et axiomes de l'école américaine. *Econometrica*, 21:503–546, 1953.
- A.B. Berkelaar, R. Kouwenberg, and T. Post. Optimal portfolio choice under loss aversion. *Rev. Econ. Stat.*, 86:973–987, 2004.
- C. Bernard and M. Ghossoub. Static portfolio choice under cumulative prospect theory. *Mathematics and Financial Economics*, 2:277–306, 2010.
- S. Biagini and M. Frittelli. A unified framework for utility maximization problems: an Orlicz space approach. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 18(3):929–966, 2008.
- L. Carassus and H. Pham. Portfolio optimization for nonconvex criteria functions. *RIMS Kôkyûroku series, ed. Shigeyoshi Ogawa*, 1620:81–111, 2009.
- L. Carassus and M. Rásonyi. Optimal strategies and utility-based prices converge when agents' preferences do. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 32:102–117, 2007.
- L. Carassus and M. Rásonyi. On optimal investment for a behavioural investor in multiperiod incomplete market models. *Forthcoming in Mathematical Finance*. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1107.1617>, 2013.
- G. Carlier and R.-A. Dana. Optimal demand for contingent claims when agents have law invariant utilities. *Math. Finance*, 21:169–201, 2011.
- C. Castaing and M. Valadier. Convex analysis and measurable multifunctions. In *Lectures Notes in Mathematics*, volume 580. Springer, Berlin, 1977.
- R.C. Dalang, A. Morton, and W. Willinger. Equivalent martingale measures and no-arbitrage in stochastic securities market models. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 29(2):185–201, 1990.
- C. Dellacherie and P.-A. Meyer. *Probability and potential*. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979.
- H. Föllmer and A. Schied. *Stochastic Finance: An Introduction in Discrete Time*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2002.
- X. He and X.Y. Zhou. Portfolio choice under cumulative prospect theory: An analytical treatment. *Management Science*, 57:315–331, 2011.
- J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev. Local martingales and the fundamental asset pricing theorems in the discrete-time case. *Finance and Stochastics*, 2:259–273, 1998.

- H. Jin and X.Y. Zhou. Behavioural portfolio selection in continuous time. *Math. Finance*, 18: 385–426, 2008.
- Y. M. Kabanov and Ch. Stricker. A teachers’ note on no-arbitrage criteria. In *Séminaire de Probabilités*, ed. Azéma, J., Émery, M. and Yor, M., XXXV, pages 149–152. Springer, New York, 2001.
- D. Kahneman and A. Tversky. Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47:263–291, 1979.
- I. Karatzas, J. P. Lehoczky, S. E. Shreve, and G. Xu. Martingale and duality methods for utility maximization in an incomplete market. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 29(3):702–730, 1991.
- D. O. Kramkov and W. Schachermayer. The asymptotic elasticity of utility functions and optimal investment in incomplete markets. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 9:904–950, 1999.
- R. C. Merton. Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: the continuous-time model. *Rev. Econom. Statist.*, 51:247–257, 1969.
- M. P. Owen and G. Žitković. Optimal investment with an unbounded random endowment and utility-based pricing. *Math. Finance*, 19(1):129–159, 2009.
- M. Rásonyi and L. Stettner. On the utility maximization problem in discrete-time financial market models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 15:1367–1395, 2005.
- C. Reichlin. Non-concave utility maximization with a given pricing measure. *Working Paper FINRISK*, (517), 2011.
- P. A. Samuelson. Lifetime portfolio selection by dynamic stochastic programming. *Rev. Econom. Statist.*, 51:239–246, 1969.
- W. Schachermayer. Optimal investment in incomplete markets when wealth may become negative. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 11:694–734, 2001.
- A. Tversky and D. Kahneman. Advances in prospect theory: Cumulative representation of uncertainty. *J. Risk & Uncertainty*, 5:297–323, 1992.